



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

This thesis has been submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for a postgraduate degree (e.g. PhD, MPhil, DClinPsychol) at the University of Edinburgh. Please note the following terms and conditions of use:

This work is protected by copyright and other intellectual property rights, which are retained by the thesis author, unless otherwise stated.

A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge.

This thesis cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the author.

The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the author.

When referring to this work, full bibliographic details including the author, title, awarding institution and date of the thesis must be given.

Glory in the Letter of Paul to the Romans: Purity, Honor, and Eschatology

W. Daniel Jackson

PhD in New Testament Language, Literature, and Theology
The University of Edinburgh
2018

I declare that this thesis has been completed solely by myself and that it has not been submitted, in whole or in part, in any previous application for a degree. Except where stated otherwise by reference or acknowledgement, the work presented is entirely my own.

W. Daniel Jackson

18/12/18
Date

Contents

Acknowledgments.....	i
Introduction.....	1
Chapter One: Glory in the History of Interpretation of Romans.....	25
Chapter Two: Glory in the Ancient World.....	55
Chapter Three: Glory in the Letters of Paul Excluding Romans.....	103
Chapter Four: Glory in Romans 1-5.....	129
Chapter Five: Glory in Romans 6-16.....	179
Conclusion.....	205
Bibliography.....	217



THE UNIVERSITY
of EDINBURGH

Abstract of Thesis

See the [Postgraduate Assessment Regulations for Research Degrees](https://www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/pgr_assessmentregulations.pdf):
https://www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/pgr_assessmentregulations.pdf

Name of student:	Walter Daniel Jackson	UUN	S1404526
University email:			
Degree sought:	PhD in New Testament Language, Literature, and Theology	No. of words in the main text of thesis:	83070
Title of thesis:	Glory in the Letter of Paul to the Romans: Purity, Honor, and Eschatology		

Insert the abstract text here - the space will expand as you type.

This thesis examines the theme of glory, signified by the Greek δόξα and cognates, in the Letter of Paul to the Romans. I argue that the language of glory of God in Romans 1-5 should be understood in view of the conceptual connection of glory with cultic purity and divine presence. This reading draws from the description of purity, sacrifice, and temple in early Judaism and Christianity as represented in the work of Jacob Milgrom and Jonathan Klawans. I argue, further, that glory in Romans 8 should be understood in terms of the eschatological experience of divine presence and transformation into glory in divine presence. The glorification of the body in Romans 8 represents the final reversal of the “dishonoring” of bodies presented in Rom 1:18-32. Additionally, I argue that Paul’s references to glory to/glorifying God should be understood in terms of the convention of honor to the divine on account of benefaction. Our study has implications for understanding Paul’s soteriology and his concept of God.

Document control

If you require this document in an alternative format please email Academic.Services@ed.ac.uk or telephone 0131 651 4990.	Date last reviewed: 15.05.15
---	------------------------------



Lay Summary of Thesis

The lay summary is a brief summary intended to facilitate knowledge transfer and enhance accessibility, therefore the language used should be non-technical and suitable for a general audience. (See the Degree Regulations and Programmes of Study, General Postgraduate Degree Programme Regulations. These regulations are available via: www.drps.ed.ac.uk.)

Name of student:	Walter Daniel Jackson	UUN	S1404526
University email:			
Degree sought:	PhD in New Testament Language, Literature, and Theology	No. of words in the main text of thesis:	83070
Title of thesis:	Glory in the Letter of Paul to the Romans: Purity, Honor, and Eschatology		

Insert the lay summary text here - the space will expand as you type.

This thesis examines the theme of glory, signified by the Greek δόξα and cognates, in the Letter of Paul to the Romans. I argue that the language of glory of God in Romans 1-5 should be understood in view of the conceptual connection of glory with cultic purity and divine presence. This reading draws from the description of purity, sacrifice, and temple in early Judaism and Christianity as represented in the work of Jacob Milgrom and Jonathan Klawans. I argue, further, that glory in Romans 8 should be understood in terms of the eschatological experience of divine presence and transformation into glory in divine presence. The glorification of the body in Romans 8 represents the final reversal of the “dishonoring” of bodies presented in Rom 1:18-32. Additionally, I argue that Paul’s references to glory to/glorifying God should be understood in terms of the convention of honor to the divine on account of benefaction. Our study has implications for understanding Paul’s theology of salvation and his concept of God.

Document control

K:\AAPS\ID-AcademicAdministration\02-CodesOfPractice,Guidelines&Regulations\24-MainReferencesCopiesPolicies\01-Current\Assessment BOE SCC & Feedback\Forms\ThesisLaySummary

If you require this document in an alternative format please email Academic.Services@ed.ac.uk or telephone 0131 651 4990.

Date last reviewed:
31.05.16

Acknowledgments

This study would not have been possible without the support of many people. Pride of place must be reserved for my doctoral supervisor, Dr. Matthew Novenson, who gave tireless feedback and exercised foresight and erudition as I was forming this argument. Dr. Novenson's insights were crucial for developing the ideas and structure of the analysis. To be mentioned here in addition are my former supervisors, Prof. Michael Gorman and Prof. Stephen Fowl. Prof. Gorman and Prof. Fowl oversaw my research as the ideas were in the earliest stages of development and continued to offer perspective all the way through. Each of these scholars has had a profound impact on the analysis and readings presented here. I express sincere gratitude to them. Of course, where there are deficiencies remaining in the argument, these are entirely my responsibility.

Others may be recognized, who contributed in many ways to the completion of this project. I must mention my examiners, Prof. Jörg Frey and Dr. Philippa Townsend, who at the end of the process offered substantive criticisms that sharpened this argument and made it less susceptible to critique. In addition, I should refer to Prof. Christof Landmesser of the University of Tübingen, who welcomed me to the faculty of Theology during an exchange to Tübingen, read my work, and offered valuable perspective. In addition to these readers, I must almost mention the many PhD colleagues of mine at the University of Edinburgh. Many of these colleagues read parts of my thesis and offered their own learned insights. Others chatted with me about matters related to the New Testament and theology and simply served as friends and sources of encouragement. An exhaustive list would be much too long. To mention here are Teresa McCaskill (my desk neighbor), Adam Trettel, Jay Thomas Hewitt, Bernardo Cho, Benj

Petroelje, Brian Bunnell, Ryan Collman, Joanna Leidenhag, Sydney Tooth, Matt Sharp, Simeon Burke, and Patrick McMurray.

In addition to these people, I must thank those who offered feedback at several professional venues. I had opportunity to present parts of this research at the University of Edinburgh Biblical Studies Seminar, the Exploring the Glory of God Conference at the University of Durham, the Annual Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, and the International Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature. I offer thanks to those who provided feedback at these venues, in particular James Dunn, Paul Foster, Larry Hurtado, Paula Fredriksen, Brent Laytham, Haley Goranson-Jacob, and Douglas Campbell. My gratitude must also be expressed for certain institutions that supported me during my taking up the work represented here. I received a Divinity fellowship from the University of Edinburgh to undertake research for this project. The University also made possible an exchange period at the University of Tübingen for the academic year 2016-2017. Also to mention here are the librarians both of the New College library in Edinburgh and the Theologicum in Tübingen, who helped in many ways, including acquiring sources for this research. Further, I must express gratitude to the Fondation Catholique Ecosaise, who funded an exchange period to the Institute Catholique in Paris, for further language study.

Finally, I must express thanks to my family and friends, who greatly improved the quality of life of this researcher, and of course without which no research project would have been possible. My thanks to the Gipsons, Parsleys, Gormans, Marshalls, McCaskills, Hewitts, Bunnells, and Collmans, who were with us at different seasons of life during theological study, both in the US and in the UK, and who remain close friends. My thanks also to Jonas Karge and Katia Bokhan in Tübingen, who were the best neighbors one could hope to have. To mention

also from the period in Tübingen are Adam Trettel, Mike Kent, and Benedikt Jetter, who peppered the intense sessions of reading and writing in the library with laughter and good conversation. I also must thank my family, the Jacksons, Collins, Jefcoats, Nguyens, Griggs, and Conways, as well as the extended family, for their support and good-natured encouragement while undertaking this project. My dad will always be my role model. The deepest expression of gratitude is reserved for my wife, Rebecca. She contributed in ways large and small to this project. She was constantly present and providing encouragement, adventure, humor, and fun. With love and gratitude, I dedicate this thesis to her.

Introduction

This study is a historical and philological examination of the theme of glory, signified by the Greek δόξα and its cognates, in the Letter of Paul to the Romans.¹ The language of glory is a common feature of present-day Christian theological parlance, and this of course should not be overlooked in historical treatment of the texts of the New Testament. Glory, understood in terms of a blessing of salvation and a matter of worth to attribute to God, often features in Christian theological reflection on the nature of salvation² and regularly appears in liturgical contexts.³ The language of glory attributed to God appears famously at the beginning of the Westminster Shorter Catechism, which lists the chief of humans as “to glorify God and to enjoy him forever.” These uses of the language of glory may be traced back to the scriptural tradition, from which Christians draw their religious vocabulary. Within the scriptural tradition, and specifically within the New Testament, the language of glory features in certain contexts more than others. The Gospel of John, the Second Letter to the Corinthians, and the Letter to the Romans stand out with respect to their emphasis on glory. The Gospel of John and 2 Corinthians are naturally worthy objects of enquiry in their own right, and much analysis has considered the use of the

¹ New Testament citations are from the 28th edition of *Novum Testamentum Graecae* and translations, unless otherwise noted, are my own. For all abbreviations I follow *The SBL Handbook of Style* (2nd ed. Atlanta: SBL, 2014). Citations and translations of Greek and Latin classical sources are from LCL except in cases otherwise noted. I use *OTP* for Old Testament Pseudepigrapha. Citations of the Greek Jewish Scriptures are from Alfred Rahlfs, *Septuaginta: Id est Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes* (2 vols.; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1979), and I provide my own translations except when citing NETS.

² See glory in, i.e., Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, “Question 93. The Happiness of the Saints and Their Mansions”; Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, Chapter 25, “Of the Last Resurrection.”

³ For example, the *Gloria Patri*, doxologies, hymns, and worship songs from various traditions. “I Stand Amazed in the Presence,” by Charles H. Gabriel, features the verse, “When with the ransomed in glory / His face I at last shall see / Shall be my joy through the ages / To sing of his love for me.” Fanny Crosby’s “To God be the Glory,” “To God be the glory, great things he hath done / So loved he the world that he gave us his son”; the song “Show Me Your Glory” by Christian rock band Third Day.

language of glory in these texts. The rationale of our study, focused as it is on the Letter to the Romans, may be considered further.

The first factor is the importance of the theme of glory within the letter. Recently it has become more widely appreciated that, within Romans, glory is a significant motif. This recognition stands in contrast to the prominent trend within the history of interpretation, including modern interpretation, of a lack of focused attention to the language of glory. Thus, Carey Newman, in an important 1992 study of glory language in Paul, remarked that a “study of Glory within the structure and theology of Romans” is a “study still awaiting attention.”⁴ Likewise, in a 2014 article Beverly Gaventa observed that of all the phrases in Paul’s letters few “could accurately be characterized as neglected.” Nevertheless, Gaventa said that the phrase “glory of God” “may well qualify for that designation.”⁵ Gaventa posited that the theme of glory, particularly the glory of God, is an important topic in the Letter to the Romans and called for further research on the theme. In line with this budding interest, several focused studies on glory in Romans have appeared in recent years in both article and monograph form. There is a growing recognition of the importance of the theme, and consequently research into the topic is currently underway.

This importance of the theme of glory in Romans may be remarked on further. The language of glory occurs 22 total times in the letter.⁶ This ties 2 Corinthians in terms of frequency, but, whereas the language of glory is concentrated to two chapters in 2 Corinthians (chapters 3-4), in Romans the language is relatively well spread out. Moreover, within Romans

⁴ Newman, *Paul’s Glory-Christology*, ix.

⁵ Gaventa, “The ‘Glory of God’ in Paul’s Letter to the Romans,” in *Interpretation and the Claims of the Text: Resourcing New Testament Theology. Essays in Honor of Charles H. Talbert* (Jason A. Whitlark et al., eds.; Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2014) 29.

⁶ Δόξα: 1:23; 2:7, 10; 3:7, 23; 4:20; 5:2; 6:4; 8:18, 21; 9:4, 23 (2x); 11:36; 15:7; 16:27. Δοξάζω: 1:21; 8:30; 11:13; 15:6, 9. Συνδοξάζω: 8:17.

the language occurs at key rhetorical moments that, in many cases, if previous readings are to be followed, reflect a continuous logic: Rom 1:18-32, 3:21-26, 5:1-11, 8:17-30, and 15:1-13. Thus, in terms of the frequency of the language and the letter's rhetorical structure, the language of glory is prominent. Moreover, considering the letter topically, glory is conceptual associated with many of the major themes of Romans. Glory is associated with the topic of God, grace, works of law, atonement, and sin. Glory occurs alongside and is conceptually related to righteousness by faith. Romans 3:21-26 presents righteousness by faith as meant to correct the issue posed in Rom 3:23, "All sinned and lack the glory of God." In Romans 5:1-11, those who are justified by faith may "boast in the hope of the glory of God," and in Romans 8 and 9 glory is held as a hope for those who are justified. One's interpretation of glory affects the interpretation of these other themes, and the converse is also true; thus, it is necessary to set these other themes as well as the theme of glory within their historical and literary contexts and see how they relate to one another and to determine their significance within Paul's theological logic.

Coupled with this recognition of the significance of the theme of glory in Romans, the second factor providing impetus for the analysis are the deficiencies among past treatments of the topic. Discussion of this merits its own section. There have been errors based on the lack of attention to the meaning of the language and failure to contextualize the language in view of its range of conceptual associations. There is also a widespread, predominant trend in interpreting the language of glory specifically in Romans—the Adam reading, as named in this study—that is problematic and should be diagnosed and corrected. More treatment of these issues appears in the next section, but these comments are enough to flag up in brief the issues with the history of interpretation that stand behind this project.

1. Problems

The problems of the history of interpretation noted above in précis may be considered in more length. The first such issue, common in the history of scholarship, is the tendency to treat glory in Romans as special language, as if the language of glory, unlike other language in the ancient world, did not bear its own defined set of meanings. Correspondingly, many past interpreters have not allowed the language to offer its own semantic contribution to the sentences in which it appears. Two older and two recent examples of this may be cited. Albert Schweitzer read the language of glory of God in Rom 3:23, “All sinned and lack the glory of glory,” as meaning “righteousness”; that is, Schweitzer posed that δόξα in the verse is synonymous with δικαιοσύνη.⁷ Importantly, and obviously, Schweitzer treated the language of δικαιοσύνη in the context as carrying its own semantic freight, i.e, that it means righteousness. However, when it came to the glory of God, Schweitzer imposed the meaning righteousness. As noted already, δόξα in Romans is in certain key instances conceptually associated with righteousness. However, Schweitzer did not seek to establish, through lexicographical analysis, that δόξα was so closely related to the idea of righteousness that it actually denoted this, and, in fact, as lexicographical analysis shows, it did not denote this.

In like manner, C. H. Dodd understood the glory of God as the “divine likeness that man is intended to bear.”⁸ Dodd’s reading related to the moral-ethical definition of glory that appears in many readings of the text. Dodd stated concerning the “all sinned and lack the glory of God,” that, “Insofar as man departs from the likeness of God he is sinful. To come short of the glory of

⁷ Schweitzer, *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle* (trans. William Montgomery; New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1931) 205.

⁸ Dodd, *The Epistle of Paul to the Romans* (MNTC; London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1932) 50-51.

God is to sin.”⁹ Dodd builds in this case on his account of the dynamics of Romans, in particular his understanding of the issue to which righteousness by faith is the solution. However, in this reading, Dodd does not in fact affirm the semantic value of the words, “They lack (come short of) the glory of God”; rather, he renders the phrase redundant in view of the immediately preceding phrase, “All sinned.” Importantly, Dodd, in a move that resembles Schweitzer, treats the language of sinning (ἁμαρτάνω) as defined by its semantic value—the meaning of the word is determined by its semantic range—but Dodd does not treat glory in this way. Instead Dodd emptied the semantic content of δόξα and treated “lack the glory of God” as simply another way of referring to human sinning.

More recent examples of this interpretive tendency may be provided. Preston Sprinkle, in a 2002 article, offered the first study focused on the language of glory in the Letter to the Romans. Sprinkle holds that glory in Romans 8 and elsewhere, when used to refer to human experience of glory (Rom 1:23, 2:7, 10, 3:23), denotes a “divine quality of life,” and specifically, in the case of Romans 8, immortality.¹⁰ Sprinkle reads glory as immortality in view of the antithetical parallelism in such texts as 8:21, “will be set free from its bondage to corruption (ἐλευθερωθήσεται ἀπὸ τῆς δουλείας τῆς φθορᾶς) in view of the freedom of the glory of the children of God (εἰς τὴν ἐλευθερίαν τῆς δόξης τῶν τέκνων τοῦ θεοῦ).”¹¹ Sprinkle’s account of the language is to a certain extent reasonable insofar as there is clearly an association of immortality with the future eschatological life, where, according to Paul’s consistent references to the topic, humans experience future glory. On the other hand, the question is whether the term

⁹ Ibid., 51.

¹⁰ Sprinkle, “The Afterlife in Romans: Understanding Paul’s Glory Motif in Light of the Apocalypse of Moses and 2 Baruch,” in *Lebendige Hoffnung – ewiger Tod?!: Jenseitsvorstellungen im Hellenismus, Judentum, und Christentum* (eds. Michael Labahn and Manfred Lang; Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2007) 216-29.

¹¹ Ibid., 215-16.

δόξα could denote “immortality,” an issue that, because of Sprinkle’s method, particularly the lack of treatment of the use of the language of glory in Paul’s linguistic contexts, Sprinkle does not explore.

A further example comes from the recent monograph on glory in Romans from Donald Berry. Berry defines glory in Rom 1:23, 3:23, 5:2, and 8:17-30 as “God’s nature and character” that humans are intended to reflect.¹² Berry connects this with the idea of an allusion to Adam with Paul’s language of glory and the Adam-Christ dualism expressed in Rom 5:12-21. Our critique is limited, in this setting, to the linguistic and conceptual question. While the image of reflecting, in Berry’s reading, appears to pick up on the use of glory as “radiance,” and the sentiment of glory as “God’s nature and character,” appears to relate to glory’s use to mean divine presence, Berry does not ground his reading, the meaning “God’s nature and character,” or the image of reflecting, central to his interpretation, through attention to the use of language in Paul’s linguistic contexts.

To be sure, there are studies that have considered glory in Romans in view of established uses of the language, and these will be examined in due course. Yet, we see in these examples, which are representative of the widespread phenomenon, the tendency not to read glory in terms of its defined range of meanings, or even to seek to account for the range of meanings of glory.

A second feature of the history of interpretation is the trend of not contextualizing the language of glory in view of its range of conceptual associations in antiquity. Here it is useful to note the important volume edited by Troels Engberg-Pederson, *Paul Beyond the Judaism/Hellenism Divide*, and the sentiment that it represents.¹³ Research has shown that it is

¹² Donald L. Berry, *Glory in Romans and the Unified Purpose of God in Redemptive History* (Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2016) 15, 17, 21, 23, 28, *passim*.

¹³ Engberg-Pedersen, ed., *Paul Beyond the Judaism/Hellenism Divide* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001) esp. 1-16, 29-80.

not appropriate to understand Paul strictly in terms of either a “Judaism” or a “Hellenism,” and that those with a historical interest in Paul ought rather to understand the apostle as a Greco-Roman person that would have been influenced by a variety of cultural, contextual forces, whether distinctly Jewish, distinctly Christian, more broadly Greco-Roman, characteristic of a particular non-Jewish and non-Christian group, or so on. Of course, where the similarities between Paul and the historical context lie must be determined on a case by case basis. But this means that, at the level of methodology, there is no patent reason to exclude, i.e., the Hellenistic data in discussion of Paul, nor to exclude the Jewish data.

This is relevant for the present study insofar as interpreters have tended to pose (tacitly, in most cases) that glory in Paul must be understood either in terms of its Jewish and scriptural background, or in terms of its Hellenistic or sociological context, or whatever isolated contextual factor. This issue poses a problem, however, insofar as, if one studies glory in view of only the use of glory in Jewish texts, one will never see the potentially generative connections that could exist between Paul and the non-Jewish literature, or, if one considers Paul in view of only the non-Jewish literature, the potentially generative connections that may exist between Paul and Jewish tradition. On the ground, one observes that, for example, Beverly Gaventa, in her recent study of the glory of God in Romans, cites only texts from the Greek Jewish scriptures and the Dead Sea Scrolls in relation to which to understand glory in Romans.¹⁴ Conversely, Halvor Moxnes, in his 1988 study focused on “honor and righteousness” in Romans, highlights only the Greco-Roman concern for honor and does not attend to the possibility that glory in Romans may be understood in view of different contextual factors, such as Jewish scriptural tradition.¹⁵ As a better way forward one would aim to consider the range of possible conceptual associations at

¹⁴ Gaventa, “The ‘Glory of God,’” 32-34.

¹⁵ Moxnes, “Honour and Righteousness in Romans,” *JSNT* 32 (1988): 61-77.

play within Paul's use of the language, not simply as a means of noting parallels but rather in seeking to understand Paul's logic in using the language.

Relatedly, one may mention in this connection the widespread phenomenon in the study of the New Testament, particularly in the Anglophone context, of the sociological/social scientific analysis of the New Testament, which implicated the language of glory.¹⁶ This approach emphasizes, among other things, the discourse of honor and shame as generative for understanding the early Christian documents, and, as is widely noted, the language of glory figures within this discourse. This emphasis is reflected in readings of glory in Romans in such studies as Halvor Moxnes and Robert Jewett.¹⁷ This contextual angle is of course appropriate to keep in view in examination of Paul's letters, but it is not the case that this is the only discursive context in which the language of glory had meaning. At the level of methodology, one must not simply highlight the conventions of honor and shame and then proceed to understand glory in Paul in view of this. An appropriate methodology considers the range of possible semantic and conceptual associations in view of which Paul's language might be understood.

Further, on this note, one discourse that has not been adequately explored in relation to glory in Paul, and yet within which glory, in Jewish and Christian literature, played a role, is the discourse of cultic purity and divine presence. The bibliography on issues of purity and impurity

¹⁶ For an introduction see Bruce J. Malina, *The New Testament World: Insights from Cultural Anthropology* (3rd ed.; Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2001); Philip F. Esler, *The First Christians in the Social Worlds: Social-Scientific Approaches to New Testament Interpretation* (London: Routledge, 1994) Richard L. Rohrbaugh, ed., *The Social Sciences and New Testament Interpretation* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2010). See also Jerome H. Neyrey, Bruce J. Malina and Richard L. Rohrbaugh, *Social-Science Commentary on the Synoptic Gospels* (2nd ed.; Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2003); David A. deSilva, *Honor Discourse and Community Maintenance in the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Rev. ed.; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008); Stanley E. Porter and Andrew W. Pitts, eds., *Christian Origins and Greco-Roman Culture: Social and Literary Contexts for the New Testament* (Leiden: Brill, 2013).

¹⁷ Moxnes, "Honour and Righteousness," 61-77; Jewett, *Romans* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007) i.e., 72, 88, 205, 280, 352. Discussed further in chapter 1.

in the ancient world, and specifically within early Judaism and Christianity, is considerable.¹⁸ As it clear from these investigations, one central issue within ancient conceptions of purity was divine presence, and, importantly, as discussed in treatment of early Judaism, the language of glory could refer to divine presence; as Carey Newman defined it, “visible, mobile divine presence.”¹⁹ Glory was in certain cases associated with conventions of cultic purity and divine presence. Recognition of this plays into our account of the contextual use of the language of glory and informs our treatment of the language of glory in Paul’s Letter to the Romans.

One further issue, the third main issue characterizing the history of interpretation to note here, is the longstanding predominant trend of understanding instances of glory in Romans in view of the putative Adam motif—the motif concerning Genesis and the idea of Adam’s divine image. This reading receives much discussion later on in the analysis, but its primary features are considered briefly here. The theory posits that in certain important places in Romans Paul, with the language of glory, refers to Adam’s glory, glory that Adam either lost or failed to attain. This is held to build upon and reflect an Adam motif that connects image of God, as presented in Gen 1:26-27, to the language of glory. This theory implicates the interpretation of almost all the major passages in Romans in which Paul refers to glory: Rom 1:18-32, 3:21-26, 5:1-11, 8:17-30, and 9:23.

¹⁸ For classic treatments see Mary Douglas, *Collected Works, Volume II. Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo* (London: Routledge, 2003); Robert Parker, *Miasma. Pollution and Purification in Early Greek Religion* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1983); Jacob Milgrom, *Studies in Cultic Theology and Terminology* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1983). See, for purity in early Judaism and Christianity, the 11-page bibliography in John P. Maier, *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus* (5 vols. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009) 4.415-26. Additionally, see Thomas Kazen, *Issues of Impurity in Early Judaism* (ConBNT 45; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2010); Christian Frevel and Christophe Nihan, eds., *Purity and the Forming of Religious Traditions in the Ancient Mediterranean World and Ancient Judaism* (Leiden: Brill, 2013); Moshe Blidstein, *Purity, Community, and Ritual in Early Christian Literature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017), and their bibliographies.

¹⁹ Newman, *Paul’s Glory-Christology*, 190.

It would be difficult to overstate the popularity of this theory.²⁰ It arose in the 19th century and has greatly gained in popularity since that time, though not without detractors. Past research has called into question the association of Adam and Genesis with Romans 1, 3, and 8, given the lack of explicit reference to Adam and, more broadly, the general lack of connection of Adam and glory throughout Paul's letters (but consider 1 Cor 11:7; 1 Corinthians 15, discussed later). Further, it has been established that the supposed interpretive motif related to Adam's lost glory as image, which might have stood behind and informed Paul's discussion, is not attested at the

²⁰ I.e., Leopold I. Rückert, *Commentar über den Brief Pauli an die Römer* (Leipzig: Hartmann, 1831) 144-47; Hans Lietzmann, *An die Römer* (HNT 8; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck] 1928) 49, 58; Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, 84-85; C. K. Barrett, *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (BNTC; London: Adam & Charles Black, 1957) 74; Jacob Jervell, *Imago Dei: Gen 1,26f im Spätjudentum, in der Gnosis und in den paulinischen Briefen* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960) 312-21; Morna D. Hooker, "Adam in Romans 1," *NTS* 6 (1960): 297-306; J. Coppens, "La gloire des croyants d'après les lettres paulinennes," *ETL* 46 (1970) 389-92; C. E. B. Cranfield, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (2 vols.; ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1975) 1.204; Ernst Käsemann, *Commentary on Romans* (trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980) 94-95, 133; A. J. M. Wedderburn, "Adam in Paul's Letter to the Romans," in *Studia Biblica 1978, III: Papers on Paul and Other New Testament Authors* (ed. E. A. Livingstone; Sheffield: JSOT, 1980) 413-30; James D. G. Dunn, *Romans 1-8* (WBC; Dallas: Word, 1998) 1-8, 60-62, 72-73, 178, 264, 464, *passim*; *Christology in the Making: A New Testament Enquiry into the Origins of the Doctrine of the Incarnation* (2nd ed.; London: SCM, 1989) 101-05, 108-13; "Adam and Christ," in *Reading Paul's Letter to the Romans* (ed. Jerry Sumney; RBS 73; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2012) 125-38; Douglas J. Moo, *The Epistle to the Romans* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996) 226; Thomas R. Schreiner, *Romans* (BECNT; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1998) 87, 187; Simon Légasse, *L'épître de Paul aux Romains* (LD Commentaires 10; Paris: Cerf, 2001) 258; Eduard Lohse, *Der Brief an die Römer. Übersetzt und Erklärt* (15th ed.; KEKNT; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2003) 131; Schwindt, *Gesichte der Herrlichkeit*, 92-105, 117-19, 138, 190; Samuel Byrskog, "Christology and Identity in an Intertextual Perspective: The Glory of Adam in the Narrative Substructure of Paul's Letter to the Romans," in *Identity Formation in the New Testament* (eds. Bengt Holmberg and Mikael Winninge; WUNT 227; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008) 1-18; Douglas Campbell, *The Deliverance of God: An Apocalyptic Rereading of Justification in Paul* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009) 658; Ben C. Blackwell, "Immortal Glory and the Problem of Death," *JSNT* 32 (2010): 301; Michael J. Gorman, "Romans: The First Christian Treatise on Theosis," *Journal of Theological Interpretation* 5 (2011): 20-22; N. T. Wright, *Paul and the Faithfulness of God* (2 vols.; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2013) 485-505; Dane Ortlund, "Inaugurated Glorification: Revisiting Romans 8:30," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 57 (2014) 111-33; Michael Wolter, *Der Brief an die Römer. Teilband 1: Röm 1-8* (EKK 6/1; Neukirchen-Vlluy: Neukirchener; Ostfildern: Patmos, 2014) 252-53, 322, 500-01; Eckhard J. Schnabel, *Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer* (Historisch Theologische Auslegung; Witten: SCM R. Brockhaus; Giessen: Brunnen, 2015) 387-88, 514; Berry, *Glory in Romans*; Richard N. Longenecker, *The Epistle to the Romans* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2017) 417; Haley Goranson Jacob, *Conformed to the Image: Reconsidering Paul's Theology of Glory in Romans* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2018).

time of Paul or in later Jewish and Christian literature.²¹ These issues have been discussed in other critical examinations of the reading. Still, the Adam reading of glory in Romans remains predominant, with no sign of abating. Two recent monograph-length treatments of glory in Romans affirm the reading;²² further, it appears in the expansive account of Paul of N. T. Wright and the recent, important commentaries of Michael Wolter and Eckhard Schnabel.²³ Within this analysis we examine this reading and rule it deficient both on grounds of the historical context and the data within Paul's letters. In view of the continuing predominance of the Adam interpretive motif of glory in Romans, this study may be viewed in part as a response to the reading, even as it is primarily oriented towards its own constructive account of the texts.

2. Evidence

Having discussed the issues of past interpretation of Romans, we may now give account of the scope of evidence of the analysis. The study, focused on the Letter to the Romans, is concerned principally with the 22 instances of the language appearing in the sixteen-chapter version of the letter. The theory of an original sixteen-chapter version is commonly affirmed and is followed here.²⁴ That said, the origin of the section Rom 16:25-27 is a matter of debate. This concerns us insofar as one instance of the language of glory appears in this section. Within this

²¹ See John R. Levison, *Portraits of Adam in Early Judaism: From Sirach to 2 Baruch* (Sheffield: JSOT, 1988) esp. 13; Sigurd Grindheim, "A Theology of Glory: Paul's Use of Δόξα Terminology in Romans," *JBL* 136 (2017): 453-57.

²² Berry, *Glory in Romans*, 11-32, 39, 47, *passim*; Jacob, *Conformed to the Image*, 73-121, *passim*.

²³ Wright, *Paul and the Faithfulness of God*, 485-505; Wolter, *Römer*, 252-53, 322, 500-01; Schnabel, *Römer*, 387-88, 514.

²⁴ As in most current scholarly accounts of the original form of Romans. See Werner G. Kümmel, *Introduction to the New Testament* (17th ed.; trans. Howard C. Kee; London: SCM, 1975) 314-20; Harry Gamble, *The Textual History of the Letter to the Romans* (Studies and Documents 42; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977) 127-42; Wolter, *Römer*, 17-20.

discussion, we examine the instance in view of its potential authenticity, but no ruling is made on the origin of the verses, and our treatment of 16:27 does not factor into any of the main conclusions of the analysis.²⁵ Occurrences of the language of glory in the letter may be grouped into two primary categories: instances thought to refer to glory for humans (1:23, 2:7, 10, 3:23, 5:2, 6:4, 8:17, 18, 21, 30, 9:4, 23 [2x]), and those thought to refer to glory for God (1:21, 3:7, 4:20, 11:36, 15:6, 7, 9, 16:27). There is also Rom 11:13, which refers to glory in relation to Paul's ministry. All the instances of the language of glory in Romans are here examined. In past treatments, in many cases only those instances thought to refer to glory for humans have been analyzed. However, the aim here is to form a comprehensive profile of the language of glory in the letter.

Beyond the data from within Romans, this study also examines the 48 instances of the language of glory that appear in the other undisputed letters of Paul (1 Thess; Gal; 1 Cor; 2 Cor; Phil; Phlm).²⁶ Considering these uses of the language naturally allow us to detect any patterns in Paul's use of the language and will be useful in understanding Romans, the primary object of enquiry. The analysis also considers the ancient contextual material, the use of the language of glory in general parlance in antiquity and specifically within early Jewish and early Christian sources. This examination enables us to draw observations about the semantic and conceptual

²⁵ The study from Larry Hurtado ("The Doxology at the End of Romans," in *New Testament Textual Criticism: Its Significance for Exegesis. Essays in Honour of Bruce M. Metzger* [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981] 185-99) challenged the old view that 16:25-27 was originally composed to conclude a 14-chapter version of the letter, by showing that the passage appears to have been composed based on a version with at least 15 chapters. I follow Hurtado in viewing this question as remaining a live one.

²⁶ Δόξα: 1 Thess 2:6, 12, 20; Gal 1:5; 1 Cor 2:7, 8, 10:31, 11:7 (2x), 15, 15:40, 41 (4x), 43; 2 Cor 1:20, 3:7 (2x), 8, 9 (2x), 10, 11 (2x), 18 (3x), 4:4, 6, 15, 17, 6:8, 8:19, 23; Phil 1:11, 2:11, 3:19, 21, 4:19, 20. Δοξάζω: Gal 1:24; 1 Cor 6:20, 12:26; 2 Cor 3:10 (2x), 9:13. Ἐνδοξος: 1 Cor 4:10.

profile of the language of glory and provides the ability to make historically sensitive interpretive decisions in relation to Paul.

3. Method

This discussion of the evidence is related and leads naturally to examination of the method of the analysis. As already mentioned, this is a historical and philological analysis of glory in Paul's Letter to the Romans. As such, the study employs methods common to the fields of biblical studies and classics. The study seeks to determine what Paul intended to communicate with the words and phrases that he used. This stands alongside and may be distinguished from other viable aims of interpretation.²⁷ In seeking to determine what Paul aimed to communicate, this study is based on appeal to the social nature of language as discussed in the work of Ferdinand de Saussure. Saussure, the father of modern linguistics, described language as a fundamentally social phenomenon, with all users of a language "linguistically linked" by the linguistic structure of a language. By "linguistic structure," Saussure meant the conventions of communication of a language as it is used within any given linguistic community.²⁸ Saussure posited that the linguistic structure, the "social aspect," of a language, is determined by the

²⁷ Quentin Skinner ("Motives, Intentions and the Interpretation of Texts," *New Literary History* 3 [1972] 393-408) distinguished between three kinds of meaning in relation to a literary work: meaning 1, which concerns the meaning of words and phrases in a work; meaning 2, which concerns the question, "What does this work mean to me?"; and meaning 3, which concerns what a writer means by what he or she says in a work (396-97). In addition, Skinner distinguished between intentions in writing and one's motivations for writing (399-402). One's motivations for writing may be said to stand outside the work in question, but to talk about an author's intentions in writing is to talk about something that is within the work itself. The language of "communicative intention" comes from Mark Brett, "Motives and Intentions in Genesis 1," *JTS* 42 (1991): 1-16; and Stephen E. Fowl, "The Use of Scripture in Philippians," in *Paul and Scripture: Extending the Conversation* (ed. Christopher D. Stanley; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature) 166-67.

²⁸ Saussure (*Course in General Linguistics* [Chicago: Open Court, 1983] 9-10): "The structure of a language is a social product of our language faculty. At the same time, it is also a body of necessary conventions adopted by a society to enable members of society to use their language faculty."

linguistic community rather than by the individual language user. In Saussure's words, the linguistic structure of a language is "external to the individual, who by himself is powerless either to create or to modify it. It exists only in virtue of a kind of contract agreed between the members of a community."²⁹ In Saussure's account, individuals do not by themselves have power to change their languages or invent new sign-to-signified relations; that is, not if they wish to be understood by anyone. Rather, individuals are bound to observe the conventions of their language as agreed upon within the linguistic community. Consequently, in the act of communication, in Saussure's words, "All the individuals linguistically linked in this manner will establish among themselves a kind of mean; all of them will reproduce—doubtless, not exactly, but approximately—the same signs linked to the same concepts."³⁰

The relevance of this for understanding Paul, particularly in view of the discussion of the history of interpretation, should be apparent. Paul, despite theories to the contrary, was restricted in the way he could use language by the norms of the language dictated to him by the linguistic community. This means, on the ground, that, in order to understand what Paul could have intended to communicate, it is necessary to consider how the language was currently being used within the linguistic community of which Paul was a member. A related question, one that follows this, is, naturally, how one determines the norms of the language within Paul's language community, an issue on which Saussure provides insight. Saussure stated, "Language at any given time involves [both] an established system and an evolution. At any given time, it is an institution in the present and a product of the past."³¹ Here Saussure draws attention both the

²⁹ Ibid., 14

³⁰ Ibid., 13.

³¹ Ibid., 9.

diachronic and synchronic in relation to language.³² That is, linguistic communities inherit their language from past users, and thus they receive a language with conventions already determined. Still, evolution of a language occurs over time as a language is used within a linguistic community.³³ The relevance of this for understanding Paul is that the history of the language, as Paul would have inherited it, is necessary to consider and, in addition, it is also necessary to consider how the language was currently being employed within Paul's community.

Regarding Paul's community, specifically those addressed in his letters, we may safely assume that they, like Paul, were fluent Greek users. Beyond this, they were also Jews and gentiles who had believed in Jesus, and by virtue of this they were members of a linguistic community that had norms of communication that were not shared by users of Greek outside of these group. In this connection, the influence of the Greek Jewish scriptures upon Christian idiom must be acknowledged. Christians, like non-Christ believing Jews in the early Roman empire, used certain modes of expression that derived from the Jewish scriptural tradition. This was part of the linguistic structure of their language community. Moreover, it is possible that specific new sign-to-signified relations developed that were distinct to the Christian community and not inherited from past users. However, these would not have developed immediately or through the agency of a single language user. As discussed in Saussure, linguistic evolution

³² Saussure states (*Course on General Linguistics*, 71-72), "At any given period, however far back in time we go, a language is always an inheritance from the past...No society has ever known its language to be anything other than something inherited from a previous generation, which it has no choice but to accept."

³³ Saussure recognized three components within linguistic change: the language, the linguistic community, and time. Saussure states concerning language, "Time changes everything. There is no reason why languages should be exempt from this universal law" (77-78). Saussure did not delineate any factors, other than time, that contribute to linguistic variability. This stands in contrast to Saussure's discussion of linguistic invariability, where he isolates several reasons for invariability within a language. This is because, according to Saussure, "The causes of linguistic continuity are in principle available to observation. The same is not true of the causes of change over time" (77).

happens through the agency of the language community and over time, as a language is used within the linguistic community.³⁴

This study, with its appeal to Saussure and the social nature of language, stands in contrast to those previous interpretation of glory in the Letter to the Romans that posed that Paul was free unilaterally to introduce new meanings to established vocabulary, particularly the language of glory.³⁵ Counter to this we work from the premise that Paul was restricted, in the way he could use language, by the norms of his language community. Accordingly, in determining how Paul could have used glory language, this study examines how the language functioned within ancient parlance across cultural contexts where Greek was employed and specifically among Jews and Christians. Towards this end the study examines the wealth of contextual material, surveying this from the standpoint of lexicography and from the standpoint of considering the conceptual associations of glory. In addition to this effort, the study also examines the language of glory in the letters of Paul outside of Romans. This comprises 48 instances of the language. In this connection 2 Corinthians 3-4 is an important site of enquiry. There are, in this material, certain patterns of linguistic and conceptual association: there is “coherence” amid the “contingency,”³⁶ an issue to which this discussion draws attention.

³⁴ Ibid., 74-78. Teresa Morgan (*Roman Faith and Christian Faith: Pistis and Fides in the Early Roman Empire and Early Churches* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015] 4) states that it is a “basic principle of cultural historiography” that “new communities forming themselves within an existing culture do not typically take language in common use in the world around them and immediately assign to it radical new meanings.” This principle holds (see further related discussion; Ibid., 32-25), but Saussure’s point (*Course in General Linguistics*, 74) that linguistic evolution is more prone to happen when a language is used within a restricted group (Saussure mentions the examples of the language of legal procedures and religious rites) should also be taken into view.

³⁵ See in this connection, in particular, the analysis of Ben Blackwell, “Immortal Glory,” (292) which poses, appealing to the discussion of Humpty Dumpty and Alice in Lewis Carroll’s *Through the Looking Glass and What Alice Found There*, the legitimacy of reading Paul as if he added meaning to the vocabulary of glory as he wished.

³⁶ To use the language of J. Christiaan Beker, *Paul the Apostle: The Triumph of God in Life and Thought* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980).

4. Thesis

The main arguments of the thesis may now be outlined. This study argues that the language of glory in Romans should be understood in terms of the conceptual association of glory with conventions of purity, honor, and eschatology; conventions that are at play at different times depending on the specific literary contexts. This study holds that the concept of divine patronage/benefaction, a convention related to honor, is at play with Paul's language of glory to/glorifying God (Rom 1:21, 3:7, 4:20, 11:36, 15:6, 7, 9, and 16:27). The traditional interpretation posits that glory in these instances means "honor" or "praise" to God. This theory is affirmed and from a conceptual perspective further developed: the concept of divine benefaction and praise given on account of benefaction squares with Paul's language and logic.

Further, this study argues, with certain past interpreters, that the language of glory in connection with future human transformation is connected both to the idea of honor and to radiance. The future eschatological body, referred to with the language of glory in Rom 8:17, 21, and 30, is honorable and radiant. Accordingly, I hold that the language of glory refers to radiance in Rom 2:7 and 10. Interpreters have been reticent to assign a specific meaning to glory in the case of Rom 2:7 and 10. I hold that glory here means radiance, alongside reference to the honor and incorruption of eschatological life.

In addition, I argue that the language of glory denotes divine presence in certain key instances in Romans: 1:23, 3:23, 5:2, 6:4, 8:18, 9:4, and 9:23. Certain interpreters have found reference to divine presence in specific of these instances, but this has not been the primary mode of understanding them. Instead, interpreters have read these as referring not to divine presence but to a human condition, particularly bearing the divine image and/or having a moral

likeness to God. Further, in connection to these instances I hold that in certain of these cases Paul refers to transformation into glory that occurs in divine presence: 8:17, 18, 21, 30, 9:4, and 9:23. Thus, in my argument, I maintain that certain occurrences of the language refer to both divine presence and to transformation of humans into glory in divine presence.

The idea of transformation into glory in divine presence, which appears in Paul and Romans in particular, accords with Jewish and Christian eschatological expectation. I hold, moreover, in relation to Rom 11:13, that Paul uses $\delta\omicron\varsigma\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omega$ to mean “to make glorious” with reference to his ministry. Here Paul means that he seeks to make his ministry radiant and thus attractive, thereby, within the rhetorical context, making Jews desire its offer of salvation.

A central argument of this study is that specific occurrences of the language of glory in Romans should be understood in view of the conceptual connection of glory with purity. I argue that Paul has conventions of purity and divine presence in view at important points in the argumentation of the letter: Rom 1:1-8-23, 3:21-26, 5:1-11, and at points within Romans 6-8. This account of glory, and the themes that it occurs alongside, stands in contrast with certain other ways of understanding the data of these passages: principally, in terms of an Adamic scheme, a cosmological/apocalyptic scheme, or a traditional lawcourt/acquittal scheme. Certain features of these ways of understanding the logic of the letter may be affirmed in specific cases, cases which must be discussed in treatment of the specific texts themselves. Still, these ways of conceptualizing the data in relation to glory are ruled deficient here insofar as they do not recognize the conceptual association of glory with purity and the implication of this for understanding Paul’s logic.

The argument in relation to this data may be presented here in *précis*. I argue that Rom 1:18-32 is an instance of purity discourse in which Paul refers to the wrath of God on account of

impurity and an accompanying loss of divine presence. Paul presents the problem in terms of the lack of the glory of God (signaled by the language of glory in Rom 1:23), the influence of impurity, and the “dishonoring” of human bodies (1:24). In Rom 3:21-26, Paul refers to the impurity of the people and lack of divine presence once again (3:23), “All sinned and lack the glory of God,” and presents Jesus as a “place of atonement” (3:25) that purifies the people and makes possible enjoyment of divine presence, in the form of the spirit in the present and in the presence of God and Jesus in the future. Purity and divine presence are at issue also in Rom 5:2 with the reference to boasting in the hope of the glory of God. In Rom 8:3, further, Paul refers to the purifying agency of Jesus again, in this case referring to Jesus as purification offering, which makes divine presence, in the form of the spirit, possible (8:4). In Romans 8, Paul refers to the hope of glorified bodies in divine presence (8:17-30), which reverses the reference to dishonoring of bodies (1:24) due to the influence of impurity in Rom 1:18-32.

The many issues and exegetical specifics of the reading will be discussed amid close examination of the passages. As part of our analysis, we consider the points of semantic and conceptual contact between the use of the language of glory in Romans and the use of the language of glory in other ancient literature. In certain instances, Paul’s use of glory in Romans show the influence of the Greek Jewish scriptures, particularly in the use of the language to denote divine presence (Rom 1:23, 3:23, 5:2, 8:18, 9:4, 9:23); the “glory to God,” “glorifying” God idiom; and the use of glory to denote radiance and “to make glorious.” In the association of glory with purity Paul shows the influence of Jewish idiom and the early Christian emphasis on moral purity and impurity. Moreover, the specific use of glory in connection with eschatological transformation shows the influence of Jewish eschatological expectation.

5. Outline

With these issues in view it is possible to outline each chapter of the study. In chapter 1 I further situate the discussion within the history of interpretation. I highlight trends in the interpretation of the language of glory, both the language of glory to God and the vocabulary thought to refer to glory for humans. I highlight the trend of understanding glory for humans in terms of a human quality, “divine likeness” or “divine image.” This is connected, moreover, with the Adam reading, which poses the connection of Paul’s glory language with the idea of Adam’s original glory or image. I highlight, in addition, the trend of honor and shame readings of Paul’s glory language. This leads to discussion of recent focused studies of the topic, the analyses of Sprinkle, Blackwell, Gaventa, and others. This chapter is important for placing the analysis within the current context of discussion related to glory in the letter. It has the function not only of introducing past readings but also of drawing attention to the methodological, contextual, and conceptual issues at play in forming an account of the theme.

In connection to these issues, in chapter 2 we explore the use of the language of glory in general in the ancient world, with, within this, an interest in the use of glory in the Jewish and Christian contexts, where the language of glory had certain diverse and well-attested conceptual associations. The chapter has two main goals: to survey the semantic range of the language of glory in general and specifically Jewish and Christian parlance; and to account for conceptual associations of the language. In line with these goals the chapter proceeds in two primary parts. In the first section we offer an account of the semantic values of the language. Here we account for the meanings “opinion,” “reputation,” “radiance,” and “divine presence.” This account of the semantic value of the language leads into discussion of the conceptual associations of the language, the task of the second section of the chapter. Here we frame the issues in terms of

“discourses” within which the language of glory functioned. In employing the historiographical category “discourse,” we are following many other studies of the New Testament;³⁷ by discourse we refer to the socio-linguistic phenomenon consisting of language and ideas that guide and characterize the treatment of a given topic. In this discussion we use discourses as a way of accounting for the associations of the language of glory beyond an account of the words’ semantic range.

The discourses surveyed in the chapter are the discourse of honor and shame, the discourse of cultic purity and divine presence, the discourse of eschatological expectation, and the discourse of primeval humanity. Certain of these discourses have been surveyed in connection to Paul’s glory language: in particular, the discourse of honor and shame, the discourse of primeval humanity, and, to a lesser extent, the discourse of eschatological expectation. Past analyses have appropriately drawn attention to these discourses in connection to Paul’s glory language, and we treat these discourses as well. In adding to the list the discourse of cultic purity and divine presence we offer further contextualization to the language of glory that proves significant for understanding the way the language of glory was used in the early Jewish and Christian contexts. In this connection, we discuss the framework of purity, sacrifice, and divine presence in the priestly material of the Hebrew Bible and the influence and presence of this framework in later Jewish and then Christian literature. We highlight the dynamics of

³⁷ See use of the category in David A. deSilva, *The Hope of Glory: Honor Discourse and New Testament Interpretation* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical, 1999); Kathy Ehrensperger, *Paul and the Dynamics of Power: Communication and Interaction in the Early Christ-Movement* (London – New York: T&T Clark, 2007); George H. Van Kooten, *Paul’s Anthropology in Context: The Image of God, Assimilation to God, and Tripartite Man in Ancient Judaism, Ancient Philosophy and Early Christianity* (WUNT 232; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008) 92-124; Blackwell, “Immortal Glory and the Problem of Death,” 286-87; Joshua W. Jipp, *Christ is King: Paul’s Royal Ideology* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2015); Matthew Thiessen, “The Many for One or One for the Many? Reading Mark 10:45 in the Roman Empire,” *HTR* 109 (2016): 447-66, 452; Moshe Blidstein, *Purity, Community, and Ritual in Early Christian Literature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017) 3-17, *passim*.

“ritual” and “moral” impurity, drawing into view the analysis of Jonathan Klawans, and explore this in relation both to early Judaism and early Christianity. Treatment of these issues stands alongside treatment of the other conventions attached to the language of glory, and by undertaking the discussion of chapter 2 we offer an account of conventions related to glory in antiquity and set ourselves up to explore glory as it is employed in the letters of Paul.

In chapter 3 we look at glory in the letters of Paul excluding Romans. In this connection the discussion poses four broader themes in relation which to understand the logic of Paul’s glory language. The themes are Believers as Pure and Holy; The Overlap of Ages; God as Patron and Benefactor; and Honor within the Group. We discuss these themes, providing account of their linguistic and conceptual profiles, and then treat specific passages in which the language of glory appears under several headings: The Process of Transformation; Eschatological Glory; Glory to God; and Glory as Esteem among People. Glory in Paul’s parlance has diverse meanings and conceptual associations. It can mean honor and be connected to the dynamics of honor and shame within the community, and particularly in connection to Paul’s authority among Christ believers. It also can refer to divine presence and to transformation into a glorious form in divine presence.

Chapter 4 takes the analysis thus offered and offers an exegetical analysis of glory in Romans 1-5. Romans 1-5 and Romans 6-8 are separated strictly due to length concerns; glory in these chapters is related, but Romans 1-5 offers enough material to explore on its own. In discussion of Romans 1-5, we provide our account of glory as connected to issues of purity and divine presence. Paul sets up a situation of loss of divine presence and the influence of impurity in Romans 1; Rom 3:21-26 refers to the lack of divine presence and the purifying function of Jesus; and Rom 5:2 anticipates the future enjoyment of divine presence. We also treat the use of

the language of glory in Romans 2, 3, and 4, and offer an account of the logic at play in these contexts.

The treatment of glory in Rom 1:18-32, 3:21-26, and 5:1-11 comprises a crucial aspect of the analysis. The argument implicates Paul's logic of the "problem" and his narration of a "solution," and thus our reading implicates the logic of justification in Paul. Our account reads the problem of Sin in terms of an inner, moral impurity issue: in Rom 1:24 God hands the people over to "impurity," which indwells the people and influences them towards vice (thus demonic agency/"impure spirits"). The bodies of the people are thus dishonored (1:24). Jesus as a purifying agent (3:25; 8:3) cleanses the people so they may enjoy divine presence in the present (through the spirit) and hope to enjoy divine presence in the future. In our account, impurity and divine presence are two important themes for understanding Paul's logic in Romans 1-5. Our account stands in contrast to previous accounts of the soteriological logic of these chapters.

Our discussion of Romans 1-5 leads to discussion of glory in the rest of the letter; in chapter 5 we explore glory in Romans 6-16. I highlight that a framework of impurity and divine presence persists into Romans 6-8 insofar as Paul continues to discuss the need for the correction of the influence of impurity/Sin on people's bodies. I argue that in Rom 6:4 the "glory of the father" means divine presence, the presence of God that indwells people and makes virtuous life possible. In Romans 8 Paul anticipates the glorification of the body so that it corresponds to Christ's glorious bodily form. This happens in divine presence (Rom 8:18) and is the reversal of the dishonoring of bodies set up in Rom 1:18-32. In Romans 9-16 Paul uses the language of glory to mean divine presence, transformation into glory in divine presence, praise, and "to make glorious."

Our account of δόξα in the Letter of Paul to the Romans will be of particular interest to those seeking to understand the Letter to the Romans, Paul, and aspects of Paul's theology, particularly Paul's soteriology. Our account shows the connection of glory in Paul's parlance with ideas of purity, honor, and eschatology. Our discussion highlights, within key contexts in Paul's letter, the connection of glory with ideas of impurity and the absence and presence of divine presence, and with transformation into an honorable and virtuous form that happens in divine presence. The discussion highlights that certain elements (namely, purity/impurity, sacrifice, divine presence and absence, and the connection of these to Sin/sins and virtue) need to be recognized in accounting for the soteriological logic of Paul's most famous letter.

1. Glory in the History of Interpretation of Romans

In continuing the discussion of glory in Romans, it remains further to situate the analysis within the history of interpretation. We have noted certain features of past readings, for instance the tendency not to ground readings on the semantic value of the language and the focus on certain conceptual dynamics. In this chapter we examine such issues in more detail with the goal of surveying the main themes of the history of interpretation of glory in Romans.¹ I highlight the discussion of the language of glory to God (Rom 1:21, 3:7, 4:20, 11:36, 15:6, 7, 9, 16:27) and then explore past readings of those instances thought to refer to glory for humans (Rom 1:23, 2:7, 10, 3:23, 5:2, 8:17, 18, 21, 30, 9:4, 9:23 [2x]).² The diversity of readings of glory, and certain central representatives of these readings, are noted, and we examine two key developments in relation to the topic: the Adam interpretive motif and honor and shame/sociological readings. In the final section we consider and interact with the recent focused treatments of theme.

1. Glory to God

The discussion begins by highlighting the ways past readers have accounted for the language of glory thought to refer to glory for God: these include the expressions “glorify” God (1:21, 15:6, 9), “glory to” God (4:20, 11:26, 16:27), and “for the glory” of God (3:7, 15:7). Certain conventions have developed in relation to this language. In this first instance,

¹ Therefore, while broader accounts of the language of glory in Paul or the New Testament are noted where relevant, the discussion has principally in view those readings focused on the Letter to the Romans.

² There are, in addition, Rom 11:13 (glory attributed to Paul’s ministry) and Rom 6:4, “raised by the glory of the Father,” which are discussed amid exegesis in chapter 5.

interpreters, particularly represented in the commentary tradition, highlight the Jewish scriptural precedent of referring to glory to God. This is assumed to be an influence upon Paul, who, as these interpreters recognize, regularly draws upon Jewish scriptural idiom. Thus, we see appeals to LXX Lev 10:3, “I will be glorified in every assembly,” in connection to Rom 1:21, “They did not glorify him as God or give thanks to him,”³ and recognition of the distinctly scriptural “give glory to God” in connection to Rom 4:20. Within these accounts, glory to God is held to mean honor and praise to God, in accordance with the scriptural usage. Thus, in this account, to glorify means “die Ehre geben und lobpreisen.”⁴

There are few exceptions to this in the history of interpretation, though there are certain exceptional cases. To highlight here are the accounts of glory and thanksgiving to God in George Boobyer and the recent reading of glorifying God presented in the study from Donald Berry. Boobyer published a 1929 treatment that dealt with the conceptuality at work in Paul’s references to thanksgiving and glory for God. Boobyer appealed to what he called an “Iranian-Gnostic light speculation,” formulated in view of Mandaean and Manichaean texts, according to which all true praise is a returning of light substance to the deity.⁵ Boobyer argued this in response to the largely-assumed convention that praise, according to early Jews and Christians, had no effect on God: God did not need praise but nevertheless desired and even required it from humans. In Boobyer’s account, the biblical God desires thanksgiving and glory because God

³ Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, 44.

⁴ Heinrich Schlier, *Der Römerbrief: Kommentar* (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1977) 55; Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *Romans* (AB 33; London: Doubleday, 1992) 282.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 35-56. See, i.e., *Ginzā: Das große Buch der Mandäer* (Quellen der Religionsgeschichte 13/4; trans. Mark Lidzbarski; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978) 1.4 (p. 5): “Gepreisen seiest du! Gesegnet, gepriesen, verherrlicht, geehrt und gefestigt sei der große, hohe, gepriesene Gott, der hohe Lichtkönig...Der reine Glanz und das große Licht, das nicht vergeht,” on which Boobyer (“*Thanksgiving*”, 39) wrote, “We are able to see at once what is meant by the employment of such a word as ‘festigen’ as a parallel to ‘preisen’ or ‘verherrlichen.’ The praise which ascends is light or rays, divine substance, power, and strength, and by this means ‘das Leben’ is ‘gefestigt.’”

needs this; to praise God, glorify and give thanks to God, is substantively to increase the “light substance” of the deity, thereby making God stronger.⁶

Boobyer’s account was not followed in later interpretation, though its argument intriguingly raised the question of the rationale at play in Paul’s references to thanksgiving and glory to God. Certain points in relation to the reading may be given. In the first case, Boobyer’s account has not withstood the test of time in terms of method. Boobyer appealed to later Gnostic texts as providing the conceptual framework for understanding earlier texts, those in the biblical tradition and in Paul—a methodological move that, though characteristic of the time, was later critiqued and fell out of favor.⁷ Second, the framework Boobyer formulates, as supposedly reflected in the Jewish scriptural material, is not well demonstrated in this material. To consider whether an “Iranian-Gnostic light speculation” was in fact at play in the later texts would go beyond the methodological purview of this analysis, but it is not clearly attested in the biblical texts Boobyer cites.⁸ Boobyer’s account was thus subject to criticism, not only on the grounds of method but also in view of its treatment of the Jewish literature.

A second nonconventional reading of glory to God is represented in the account of Donald Berry. Berry’s account of the meaning of glory for God affect how he understands the

⁶ Ibid., 56-72. See, i.e., OG 1 Chron 16:27, “Glory and praise are before him (δόξα καὶ ἔπαινος κατὰ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ), strength and pride are in his place (ισχύς καὶ καύχημα ἐν τόπῳ αὐτοῦ),” on which Boobyer states (59), “Here again the ἔπαινος is something which is κατὰ πρόσωπον of Jahweh as the δόξα, that is, it is the shining splendour of Jahweh as the δόξα. Noteworthy is the use of ισχύς...It reminds us that this realistic ἔπαινος or δόξα of Jahweh is ισχύς.”

⁷ See in this connection the discussion of Bultmann’s reliance on Gnostic sources and the theory of an early Gnostic Redeemer myth in Bruce W. Longenecker and Mikael C. Parsons, eds., *Beyond Bultmann: Reckoning a New Testament Theology* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2014) 65-68, 130-31.

⁸ Boobyer cites, in addition to OG 1 Chron 16:27, 1 Chron 16:28, Isa 42:8, 48:9, Hab 3:3, Ps 29:1 66:2, 71:8. OG 1 Chron 16:28, “Give to the Lord, fathers of the nations, give to the Lord glory and power (δοτε τῷ κυρίῳ δόξαν καὶ ἰσχύν),” might lend itself to Boobyer’s reading. In other cases Boobyer’s framework is not well reflected (i.e., OG Isa 42:8, “my glory I give to no other, my praise to idols” refers to glory as honor; OG Hab 3:3, “His virtue covers the heavens, and the earth is full of his praise).

language of glory to God. Berry defines instances of the language across the letter, such as in Rom 1:23, “exchanged the glory of God,” as referring to “God’s nature and character.”⁹ Ideally humans, for Paul, are meant to “reflect” God’s nature and character: to exchange God’s glory, as in Rom 1:23, means that humanity “no longer reflects the glory they were meant to reflect in their bodies.”¹⁰ Berry sees this framework at play also in references to glory to God: in Berry’s definition, to “glorify” God is “to respond appropriately to one’s whole life to the revelation of God’s glory—to live in such a way that one’s life reflects the truth about God that has been made known to them.”¹¹ Berry here holds that the conceptual framework at work with Paul’s references to glory to God is the same framework at work with Paul’s references to glory for humans. Yet, in both cases, the readings of glory are not established through attention to the use of glory within Paul’s linguistic community—an issue, as discussed in the introduction, crucial for forming an account of the meaning of Paul’s language. Reserving our comments, for the moment, to the language of glory to God, it is not the case that the Greek Jewish scriptures or other literature uses the language of glory to mean “to reflect.” Berry cites no contextual material in which the language functions this way.¹² Further, leaving to the side the question of the historical context, there are settings in Paul in which the idea of reflecting God’s glory back to God is incoherent in relation to Paul’s deployment of the language. For instance, in Rom 3:7, God shows himself to have integrity amid human unfaithfulness, which “abounds to his glory.” In Berry’s logic, God’s integrity is a means of God reflecting God’s glory back to God. Rather

⁹ Berry, *Glory in Romans*, 15, 17, 21, 23.

¹⁰ Ibid., 17. Berry elsewhere refers to “displaying” God’s glory (19, 21, 59).

¹¹ Ibid., 15.

¹² Ibid., 15. Berry mentions the LXX (and comments from Kittel; Dunn) in connection to his reading of glory but does not cite any primary texts that attest to the idea of reflecting.

than imposing this perplexed image onto Paul's language, it is better to see glory here functioning as it does elsewhere, namely as referring to honor and praise for God.

In view of this discussion, then, the traditional account of glory to God as praise and honor to God continues to hold. This use aligns with the meaning of the language in the historical context and with the literary contexts in which Paul employs the language. One further issue, however, is the conceptuality at play in Paul's use of glory as praise to God. Boobyer raised the question of the ideas behind Paul's references to glory to God. In general interpreters of Romans have recognized the idea of obligation at work in the concept of glorifying: humans are obligated to give God praise, and failure to do this is an offense against God. But the specific rationale is relatively underexplored. In this connection, the methods of sociological analysis of the New Testament have raised the question of whether early Christian authors envisioned God in terms of the norms of divine patronage and benefaction.¹³ Certain studies have argued in favor of this view in relation to Paul, which would implicate the language of glory to God by grounding the sense of obligation in terms of reciprocity. In this study, we explore this possibility in more detail through close attention to the texts themselves and will aim determine whether the model of sociological analysis aligns with the details of Paul's language and logic.

2. Glory for Humans: Diverse Readings

¹³ David A. deSilva, *Honor, Patronage, Kinship, and Purity: Unlocking New Testament Culture* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2000); Jerome H. Neyrey, "God, Benefactor and Patron: The Major Cultural Model for Interpreting the Deity in Greco-Roman Antiquity," *JSNT* 27 (2005): 465-92; Zeba A. Crook, "The Divine Benefactions of Paul the Client," *JCRCJ* 2 (2001-2005): 9-26; Idem., *Reconceptualising Conversion* (BZNW 130; Berlin – New York: de Gruyter, 2004) 65-89; Peter Lampe, "Paul, Patrons, and Clients," in *Paul in the Greco-Roman World: A Handbook* (ed. J. Paul Sampley; Harrisburg, PA – London: Trinity Press International, 2003) 204-38.

This short survey concludes the examination of history of interpretation of the language of glory to God in Romans. There is comparatively less to say on this theme; much more attention has been devoted, and more interpretive diversity exists, in relation to those instances thought to refer to glory for humans. This diversity may be examined in more detail. Proposals about the meaning of glory for humans abound. Proposals include that the language means “righteousness,” “divine likeness,” “divine presence,” “radiance,” “honor,” “immortality,” “transcendent condition of life,” “divine favour,” “dominion,” and “sanctifying grace,” including others, with, in certain instances, these proposals being combined. Remarking on the diversity among accounts of the language of glory in Rom 3:23, the controverted passage, “All sinned and lack the glory of God,” Leon Morris, upon surveying the literature, stated, “Commentators tend to read their own meaning into the passage.” This observation holds in the case of many readings: interpretations are often not grounded on exegesis of Paul or the meaning of glory but are rather based on uncritical factors. Certain of the above noted proposals, and their representatives, may be considered more closely. As noted in the introduction, the reading “righteousness” appeared in the account of Schweitzer.¹⁴ This reading recognizes the coordination of glory language with righteousness language, as in 3:23-24, “For all sinned and lack the glory of God, they are not justified by his grace.” The justifying addresses the lack (or the falling short, as interpreters have often read ὑστερέω in 3:23) of the glory of God, and Schweitzer understands this to mean that the glory of God is the righteousness; thus to justify is to attribute the righteousness that Paul indicates is lacked by the statement “they lack the glory of God.”

¹⁴ Schweitzer, *Mysticism*, 205.

The reading of Schweitzer raises certain questions. Did glory or the phrase the glory of God ever mean “righteousness” in ancient Greek, either within the general pagan context or specifically among Jewish and Christian language users? Schweitzer cites no supporting examples of this. Further: why allow the language of righteousness to determine the meaning of glory? Schweitzer allows “righteousness” to carry its own semantic freight; but, when it comes to glory, he imposes the meaning “righteousness.” According to Schweitzer’s assumed linguistic method, there is no patent reason it should not be the other way around. But, this is not valid from a linguistic perspective. The language of righteousness had its own defined set of meanings, as determined by the use of the language within the linguistic community, and likewise glory had its own defined set of meanings.

Schweitzer’s account of the meaning of the glory of God in Rom 3:23 is indicative of the longstanding state of discussion of glory in Romans. As reflected in Schweitzer, there has long been among interpreters a certain lack of rigor in relation to the language, manifested both in a lack of attention to the meaning of the language within Paul’s linguistic community (take, as further examples, the proposals that glory means “divine favour,” “sanctifying grace,” and “eternal blessedness”) and the imprecision of past readings. In connection to this latter point, many examples may be offered, for instance the readings of glory in Ernst Käsemann and James Dunn. Käsemann read the glory of God as the “radiance which according to the apocalyptic view awaits the justified in heaven.”¹⁵ Yet, in the same context, Käsemann also equated the glory of God with divine likeness/image and with righteousness (in parallel to Schweitzer). Käsemann did not reconcile how glory as “radiance” relates to his definition of glory as divine image and righteousness, and, to further complicate the portrait, Käsemann defines the divine likeness as a

¹⁵ Käsemann, *Commentary on Romans*, 94-95.

relational idea: remarking on the glory of God, Käsemann states, “The apostle does not understand the divine image as a *habitus* but as a right relation of the creature to the Creator.” Käsemann does not seek to reconcile his reading of glory as radiance with the relational, divine image interpretation of glory he offers. In similar manner Dunn defines the glory of God as at the same time “dominion,” “divine presence,” and “immortality,” such that, in Rom 3:23, “all sinned and lack the glory of God,” Paul has in view lacking/fall short of each of these things simultaneously. Dunn makes imprecise interpretative claims in relation to glory while being more precise in relation to other themes.

The reading “divine likeness,” “divine image,” for glory, significant due to its popularity,¹⁶ may be considered further. This divine likeness is in many cases interpreted ethically: thus, to have the glory of God is to be like God in an ethical sense. The reading “divine likeness,” “divine image,” is related to the Adam reading, discussed below. In many versions of the theory there is a putative equivalence between the language of glory and the language of likeness, whether the terms *ὁμοίωμα* or *εἰκών*. This idea, though, is objectionable from a linguistic perspective. To be sure, the language of glory occurs alongside the language of likeness and image in certain context in Paul’s letters (1 Cor 11:7, 2 Cor 3:18, 4:4-6, Rom 1:23, 8:29). However, the language of glory does not mean “likeness” or “image”; glory means “honor,” “reputation,” “radiance,” “divine presence,” and so on, depending on the context.¹⁷

¹⁶ Käsemann, *Romans*, 94-95; Dodd, *Romans*, 50-51; Barrett, *Romans*, 74. Moo, *Romans*, 226, “being-like-God”; Ortlund, “Inaugurated Glorification,” 117.

¹⁷ See Markus Bockmuehl’s remarks amid discussing *μορφή* in Phil 2:6 (“‘The Form of God’ (Phil 2:6) Variations on a Theme of Jewish Mysticism” *JTS* 1997 [48]: 8): “It has...become commonplace to argue that the theological context of Phil 2:6 effectively makes [*μορφή*] equivalent of the terms *εἰκών* and *δόξα*. Despite the widespread claims to this effect, however, the evidence for actual synonymy is very weak indeed...There is of course admittedly a certain conceptual link in the sense that both terms designate attributes of the same object. That fact in itself, however, does not signal conflation. Corn flakes, toast, and orange juice may be discrete aspects of the same breakfast. In the same way, God’s

The reading of William Sanday and Arthur Headlam affirms the meaning radiance for the glory of God but states further that glory means radiance as this “symbolized the divine perfections” and this as “communicated to man through Christ.” Sanday and Headlam held, “Both morally and physical a certain transfiguration takes place in the Christian, partially here, completely hereafter.”¹⁸ It is not clear, however, why Sanday and Headlam pose a symbolic meaning in relation to glory. Why could the language not simply mean “radiance”? Sanday and Headlam appear to seek to incorporate the language of glory into their account of the argumentative trajectory of the letter: humans are sinful, and Paul refers to this being sinful with the statement “all lack the glory of God,” that is, all fail to be morally like God. However, this reading does not account for the semantic and conceptual possibilities of the language of glory: could it not, as in certain other interpretations, refer to God’s honor, God’s presence, God’s radiance? Sanday and Headlam, along with those interpreters that propose the meaning “divine likeness” or “divine image,” pose a meaning of glory without appreciation for the fact that Paul used the language of glory rather than the language of likeness, image, or other such vocabulary.

3. The Adam Reading

Discussion of the reading “divine likeness” leads naturally to examination of an interpretive motif that posits that Paul, with the language of glory, alludes to Adam and Genesis 1-3, here called the Adam reading. The Adam reading surfaced in the 19th century and since then has become by far the most common way of understanding the language of glory for humans in Romans. An early example is represented in the 1831 commentary of Leopold Rückert. Rückert

‘form’ and his ‘glory’ are two different things; his ‘form’ and his ‘image’ are also two different things. Their conceptual proximity does not make them synonyms.”

¹⁸ Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, 84-85.

read glory in Rom 3:23 and 5:2 in view of Paul's supposed "Theologie Ebenbild Gottes."¹⁹

Rückert noted settings in Paul where the language of δόξα and εἰκών appear alongside one another in Paul's letters (1 Cor 11:7-8, 2 Cor 4:4-6). In view of these settings, Rückert posed synonymy between δόξα τοῦ θεοῦ and εἰκών τοῦ θεοῦ and connected this to Genesis: Rückert posed that "man δόξα τοῦ θεοῦ von einer Ähnlichkeit mit Gott, einer gottähnlichen δόξα verstehen dürfte" and that the glory of God in Rom 3:23 and 5:2 should be understood in connection to Eph 4:23-24 and Col 3:10, where the Pauline author speaks of being renewed "according to the image" of the creator.²⁰ Thus, to speak of lacking or falling short of the glory of God, as well as to speak of the boast in the glory of God in Rom 5:2, is to speak of the image of God referred to in Gen 1:26-27.

Rückert's reading represents an early link in the chain that extends into the present, and the connections Rückert made, for instance, between 2 Cor 4:4-6, 1 Cor 11:7-8, Ephesians, and Colossians and the language of glory in Romans, continue to be affirmed within scholarship on Paul. In certain obvious respects, however, the reading has developed, and these developments should be noted. Following Rückert the Adam reading appeared regularly in later interpretation, for instance in the commentaries of Hans Lietzmann, Sanday and Headlam, and C. K. Barrett. Accompanying the increasing popularity of the reading, in 1960 the study of Jacob Jervell, *Imago Dei: Gen 1,26f im Spätjudentum, in der Gnosis und in den paulinischen Briefen*, appeared and presented arguments that would solidify the way glory in Romans were to be interpreted. Jervell's study explored the reception of Gen 1:26, which refers to the creation of Adam in God's image and the giving of dominion to Adam, in later Jewish literature, including within Paul. Jervell's account posed that there were certain unified interpretations of Gen 1:26, according to

¹⁹ Rückert, *Römer*, 144-47.

²⁰ Ibid., 146-47.

which Adam and the image of God were regularly connected to ethics, Israel, Moses, and the law, on the one hand, and to Israel's taking up of eschatological dominion, on the other. In this connection Jervell cited diverse texts, including *Test. Naph.*, *4 Ezra*, *Ben Sira*, *2 Enoch*, *Wisdom of Solomon*, and *Apocalypse of Moses*, among many others.²¹ In addition, Jervell detected parallel motifs in rabbinic sources, *Genesis Rabbah*, *Pesiqta Rabbati*, *Sifre Deuteronomy*, and others. Jervell posed this as the background for understanding texts in Paul. This implicated in particular certain texts that feature the language of glory: 1 Cor 15:35-58, 2 Cor 3:18-4:6, Rom 1:23, 3:23, and 8:29. For instance, in regard to 2 Cor 3:18-4:6, concerning the glory of Moses and the glory of Paul's ministry, Jervell stated

Die göttliche Doxa wurde dem Erstgeschaffenen, Adam, gegeben. Sie ging mit dem Sündenfall verloren, wurde aber Israel durch Mose auf dem Sinai wiedergegeben. Die mosaische Doxa ist nun nichts anderes als die Gottebenbildlichkeit, wonach Doxa die Bedeutung Abglanz bekommt und für Eikon benutzt werden kann.²²

Here we see Jervell's posed equivalence between glory and image ("die göttliche Doxa") and the supposed framework (Adam had glory, lost this, but within Israel, following the law, this glory as God's image may been restored). Glory, Jervell held, had the meaning Abglanz, reflection, but can be used in place of the word εἰκών. This framework of ethics, Israel, Adam, image of God, and its connection to glory also appears in Jervell's account of glory in Romans. Like Rückert, Jervell affirms the connection of Adam and the lack of God's glory in Rom 3:23.²³ Further, Jervell draws into this connection glory in Rom 1:23, "they exchanged the glory of the immortal God for images..." and Rom 8:29, with its reference to being conformed into Christ's "image."

²¹ For more on the "ethical-anthropological" and "historical-speculative" interpretations, and the texts thought to reflect these, see *Imago Dei*, 26-51.

²² *Ibid.*, 175-76.

²³ *Ibid.*, 282, 330.

On this latter passage, Jervell appeal to the connection of glory and image of God: “die Vorstellung von der Christusgleichheit, von der Gottebenbildlichkeit mit derjenigen von der Herrlichkeit, δόξα, zusammenhängt.”²⁴ (280). With respect to Rom 1:23, Jervell holds that Paul combines Ps 106:20 with Gen 1:26 and that the exchange of God’s glory refers to the human’s exchange of God’s image (312-31). This image may be restored through observance of the law, but neither Jews nor non-Jews observe the law.²⁵

Jervell’s account of the background of key texts where Paul uses the language of glory proved decisive for much later interpretation. In the first instance, Jervell was thought to have provided a convincing account of the reception of Adam and Gen 1:26 in later Jewish literature. Further, Jervell was thought to have placed Paul’s discussion of glory within its proper conceptual context. Another study related to Paul’s glory language, worth mentioning here, also appeared in 1960, namely the article “Adam and Romans 1” by Morna Hooker. Like Jervell, Hooker argued for the presence of allusion to Adam in Rom 1:18-32, and particularly in relation to Rom 1:23 with its reference to the glory of God. Hooker held that Paul is “describing man’s sin in relation to its true Biblical setting—the Genesis narrative of the Creation and the Fall.”²⁶ Hooker noted certain verbal correspondences: like Jervell, Hooker recognizes the parallel with Ps 106:20, but in addition holds that the language of Gen 1:20-26 also appears in Rom 1:23. This, Hooker holds, reflects an intentional allusion to Genesis: “Paul...has deliberately chosen the terminology of the creation story.”²⁷ Hooker holds, in relation to the language of glory in Rom 1:23, that this refers to “worship,” but holds that the word also has “yet another shade of meaning,” and here, like Jervell, posits that this refers to the glory that man originally

²⁴ Ibid., 280.

²⁵ Ibid., 330.

²⁶ Hooker, “Adam in Romans 1,” 300.

²⁷ Ibid.

possessed.²⁸ Hooker nuances her reading of glory and image: Hooker does not pose equivalency between the two terms; rather, the glory of God is associated with image as well as dominion. In Hooker's words, Paul and the rabbinic literature agree that what humans lost were "the glory of God and the dominion over Nature which were associated with that image." Hooker holds that the discussion of Romans 1 is reflective of the motif of Adam's sin that, while implicit in the earlier text, is explicit in Rom 5:12-21.²⁹

Jervell and Hooker thus sought to offer contextual grounding to the reading and, in addition, argued for the presence of allusion to Adam in Romans 1 and 8. A further influential account of glory in Paul that poses a connection with Adam, particularly influential in the Anglophone context, is the treatment of glory in the research of James Dunn. Dunn finds Adam in connection to glory in Rom 1:18-32, 3:23, 5:2, and 8:17-30 (in addition to finding this in other texts in Paul; 2 Cor 3:18-4:6; 1 Cor 15:35-58; Phil 3:21; Col 3:4, 10).³⁰ In this Dunn poses an Endzeit als Urzeit scheme: Dunn writes, "Paul understands *salvation as the restoration of the believer to the glory* which man now lacks as a result of his/Adam's sin (Rom 3:23) [italics original]."³¹ Dunn draws into view contextual material discussed in Jervell (i.e., *Genesis Rabbah*; *Apocalypse of Moses*). In addition, Dunn cites certain examples from the Dead Sea Scrolls that refer to the glory of Adam (1QS IV, 23; CD III, 20, 1QH XVII, 15). These, Dunn recognizes, do not refer to Adam's original glory but refer instead to the glory of Adam as an eschatological hope.

The Adam reading, as noted, is now common in the secondary literature, and is represented and found key formulation in the treatments of Jervell, Hooker, and Dunn. In certain

²⁸ Ibid., 305.

²⁹ Ibid., 305-06.

³⁰ Dunn, *Christology in the Making*, 101-07.

³¹ Ibid., 105-06.

important respects, however, the Adam reading has been criticized, both in terms of its appeal to the contextual material and in terms of its basis in the texts of Paul. In the first instance one may note the 1988 study of John Levison. This discussion criticized past accounts of the reception of Adam in early Jewish literature, insofar as they misconstrued the data in order to provide background material for Paul's letters. These accounts posed motifs such as "Adam: The Origin of Sin and Death," "Adam as the First Father of Israel," and "Adam as the Image of and Promise for Eschatological Humanity," motifs that square with interpretation of Paul but not, Levison holds, with the diverse appropriations of Adam in early Judaism.³² Levison showed the diversity within early Jewish literature that used the figures of Genesis 1-3: Levison argued that early Jewish authors "creatively developed portraits of Adam by adapting Genesis narratives to their individual *Tendenzen*."³³ There are, as Levison noted, conventions within the literature, certain unified perspectives; but these, Levison holds, are due to similar *Tendenzen*, while differences are due to differences of *Tendenz*. This argument stands against the widespread phenomenon of finding a singular "Adam speculation" or "Adam mythology" as background for Paul's discussions of Adam.

This is relevant in relation to this discussion insofar as it undermined the account of Jacob Jervell and his notion of singular widespread interpretations along the lines of "ethical-anthropological" and "historical-speculative," which posed the existence of consistent conceptual connections of Adam, the image of God, glory, ethics, dominion, and Moses, etc., along the lines noted above. The study of Levison illustrated that, if one is to understand Paul's statements related to Adam within their historical context, this must be done at the level of specific texts vis-à-vis Paul rather than any broad unified motifs in relation to Paul.

³² Levison, *Portraits of Adam*, 14-23.

³³ *Ibid.*, 145.

Further, in this connection, there is the chronological issue in relation to those texts cited in support of the reading: namely, as it has appeared in much discussion, *Apocalypse of Moses*, *Genesis Rabbah*, *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan*, *3 Baruch*, *Apocalypse of Sedrach*, *Testament of Abraham*, *Apocalypse of Adam*, and the texts from the Dead Sea Scrolls. In the case of the Dead Sea Scrolls, as noted before, there are texts that refer to Adam's glory as an eschatological hope. There is, moreover, 4Q504 VIII, 4, which states, "[...Adam,] our fa[ther], you fashioned in the image of your glory." In the case of the other texts, these refer to Adam and/or Eve's loss of glory. Past research has highlighted the late date of these texts relative to Paul: *Apocalypse of Moses*, *Testament of Abraham*, and *Apocalypse of Adam* may date to the end of the first century at the earliest, though they could have been composed later, while the others date, where they can be dated confidently, from the third to the eighth centuries.³⁴ Moreover, concerning the Dead Sea Scrolls, Sigurd Grindheim has noted the distinction between Adam's glory and God's own glory; a distinction not observed by past proponents of the Adam reading. The texts from the DSS refer to Adam's glory, namely as an eschatological hope, while Paul's letters refer to the glory of God without any explicit reference to Adam's glory.

Additional points about the contextual material will be offered later in the discussion. There are, in addition, the criticisms lodged against the Adam reading based on the data of Paul's letters. Joseph Fitzmyer called the idea that Paul alludes to Adam's loss of glory in Rom 3:23 "eisexegetical,"³⁵ and, in like manner, Preston Sprinkle and Carey Newman, in view of the

³⁴ On *Apoc. Mos.* see Johannes Tromp, *The Life of Adam and Eve in Greek* (PVTG 6; Leiden: Brill, 2005) 28. *3 Baruch* cannot be confidently dated (see Alexander Kulik, *3 Baruch: Greek-Slavonic Apocalypse of Baruch* [CEJL; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2010] 12). Ephrem, 4th cent.; *Genesis Rabbah*, 4th to 6th century (Neusner, *Genesis Rabbah*, 1.104-06); *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan*, 7th to 8th century (though it contains ancient traditions; Maher, *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Genesis* [ArBib 1B; Collegeville, MN: Liturgical, 1992] 11-12).

³⁵ Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 347.

literary contexts of Paul's letters, view the reading as dubious.³⁶ This criticism is based on the lack of explicit reference to Adam in connection with glory, either the loss or future restoration of this glory, in Paul's letters. Accordingly, Beverly Gaventa highlighted that Paul refers explicitly to God's glory and Christ's glory, not the glory of Adam, and that this should figure more prominently than it has in past readings.³⁷ Klaus Haacker framed the criticism in terms of three elements; the lack of explicit reference in Paul's letters, the lack of attestation in the contextual material, and the improbability that Paul's first audience would be able to discern the Adam motif. In Haacker's words, "Das Problem dieser Auffassung ist, daß eine relative selten belegte frühjüdische Vorstellung, ohne explizit ausgesprochen zu sein, bei Paulus oder gar seinen römischen Lesern als bekannt vorausgesetzt wird."³⁸

4. Honor and Shame

Notwithstanding these criticisms, interpreters continue to affirm the Adam reading of glory. The reading appears in the full-scale study of Paul of N. T. Wright, the important commentaries of Eckhard Schnabel and Michael Wolter, and in recent focused studies of glory in Romans.³⁹ These recent focused studies, along with the other recent focused studies, are discussed later in this chapter. A further development to note here in relation to the history of interpretation of glory in Romans are honor and shame readings of the language. This comprises principally the readings of glory in Romans of Halvor Moxnes, Robert Jewett, and James Harrison. These readings are reflective of the interest in sociological/honor and shame dynamics

³⁶ Sprinkle, "The Afterlife in Romans," 231-32; Newman, *Paul's Glory-Christology*, 225-26.

³⁷ Gaventa, "The 'Glory of God'," 30-32.

³⁸ Haacker, *Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer* (3rd ed.; THKNT 6; Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2006) 97.

³⁹ Wright, *Paul and the Faithfulness of God*, 485-505; Wolter, *Römer*, 252-53, 322, 500-01; Schnabel, *Römer*, 387-88, 514. Focused studies cited below.

in the New Testament more generally. Whereas previous study had focused on the Septuagintal and putative Adam background, this reading posits that in at least some cases Paul's language of glory for humans should be understood in terms of the meaning of glory as "honor" and the dynamics of honor and shame characteristic of Greco-Roman cultures in general. Thus, Moxnes, in his 1988 study, posited that Paul was part of an "honour society" and that concepts of honor and shame "determined the way in which he spoke of justification and righteousness."⁴⁰ This idea affects Moxnes' account of Paul's glory language. Thus, Moxnes holds that in Romans 2, with Paul's references to "glory, honor, and incorruption" (2:7), that Paul addresses a "situation of competition for honour," and that Paul "works within a well-known scheme of honour granted by the superior to a subordinate on the basis of good acts." Correspondingly Moxnes holds that Paul's point in Romans 2 is that "there is no distinction between Jews and non-Jews: both groups will receive honour and punishment on the same basis."⁴¹ Moxnes also finds the concern for honor present in Romans 8. Through the spirit, the believers had "received the honourable position of being children of God" but their status is currently unrecognized. The believers live as "sons without honour," but they look forward to when they will be "glorified with Jesus" and "the entire world will recognize their honour."⁴² Here Moxnes posits that the experience of being glorified, in Romans 8, is not a taking on of "divine likeness" or some other ethical quality, as in the past history of interpretation, but instead an honoring involving an exaltation of status.

Like Moxnes, Jewett finds concern for honor and distaste for shame as a central motif in the Letter to the Romans. Jewett follows Moxnes in seeing Paul setting up justification in terms of the concern for honor, but Jewett takes Moxnes' account a step farther in grounding this

⁴⁰ Moxnes, "Honour and Righteousness in Romans," 63.

⁴¹ Ibid., 69.

⁴² Ibid., 73.

interpretation in a concrete theory of the background that gave rise to the letter. In Jewett's view, the multiple house churches to which Paul addressed the letter "were engaged in fierce competitions with one another for superior honor," and this presented a problem for Paul, since it might impede the westward advance of Paul's mission.⁴³ Thus, in Jewett's account, Paul writes Romans to counteract the unhealthy struggle for honor and encourage unity. Jewett holds that the Jewish and gentile audience were "intent to maintain precedence in glory and honor compared with others," which provides the background for what Paul says in Rom 3:23.⁴⁴ Jewett states concerning Romans 3:23, "To fall short is an honor issue and it resonates with the competition for honor within and between groups in the Greco-Roman world...Despite the claims of Jews and Greeks to surpass each other in honor and despite their typical claims that the other groups are shameful...Paul's claim is that *all* fall short of the transcendent standard of honor."⁴⁵

The readings of Moxnes and Jewett were welcome insofar as they drew attention to the semantic and conceptual connection of glory language with honor and with the conventions that guided discussion of one's honor and intra-group dynamics. These connections had been overlooked in discussion of Paul's references to glory for humans, a matter of some irony given that interpreters had recognized glory as "honor" in relation to Paul's references to glory to God/glorifying God. The readings of Moxnes and Jewett are, however, subject to critique, as already discussed by certain other respondents. One could easily object to Moxnes definition of being glorified in Romans 8 as strictly an experience of honoring or exaltation: this does not square with the context of Romans 8 (Rom 8:29-30, where being glorified and being

⁴³ Jewett, *Romans*, 72, 88, "If the Gentile and Jewish Christians continued to shame each other, they would carry the gospel to the barbarians in Spain that would continue the perverse system of honor on which the exploitative empire rested."

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 205.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 280; cf. on Rom 5:2 (352): the audience is to "abandon any effort to claim superior honors for oneself or one's group."

“conformed” to the image of God’s son are clearly related) or with Paul’s references to glory for humans in other letters (2 Cor 3:18; Phil 3:20-21; discussed in chapter 3 section 2.1). In addition, Moxnes and Jewett do not convincingly show from the data within Romans that the concern for honor was as important within the letter as their readings present it. Romans 2:1-11 is arguably not at all about rival factions of Jews and gentiles divided over which group is honorable, and by what means honor is acquired; the text has in view eschatological judgment and the rewards or punishments for doing either good or bad. Other points may be mentioned in relation to Jewett’s theory of the background of the letter (the question of whether Claudius’ edict truly created tension between Jews and gentiles; whether the audience was divided into Jew and gentile or primarily gentile). In the final assessment, Moxnes’ and Jewett’s readings of glory for humans in Romans are in many cases not convincing, specifically those readings that appeal to a supposed concern for honor/competition for honor behind the letter’s genesis. On the other hand, Moxnes and Jewett are to be commended in drawing attention to what were previously entirely overlooked (in modern interpretation of Paul) semantic and conceptual associations of glory—associations that have figured into interpretation of glory in Romans following these readings (Harrison; Blackwell; Jacob) and that inform the treatment of glory in this analysis.

5. Recent Focused Studies

We have surveyed the tendencies in modern interpretation of glory for humans in Romans, and it remains to consider recent focused studies on the topic. Before turning to this, however, it is useful to highlight certain studies that highlight the connection of glory with divine presence in relation to Paul’s letters. That the language of glory was used to denote divine presence in Jewish idiom has long been well-recognized. Certain analyses have highlighted this

in connection to Paul's glory language, as in discussion of glory in 2 Corinthians 3-4, and in certain cases in discussion of glory for humans in Romans—though this way of understanding has not been conventional. Franz Leenhardt understood glory in relation to humans as in certain cases referring to divine presence itself.⁴⁶ Other interpreters have held that glory in Romans is related to divine presence (see Sanday and Headlam; Fitzmyer),⁴⁷ however Leenhardt held that glory in Romans in fact denoted divine presence. This stands in contrast to the widespread tendency of understanding glory, including the “glory of God,” as a human quality; “divine image,” “divine likeness,” “being-like-God,” and so on.

Significant for the topic of glory as divine presence in Paul is the 1992 study of Carey Newman. This study is relevant for its consideration of glory as divine presence in both the early Jewish scriptures and Paul's letters. Newman was not the first to explore the use of the language of glory as divine presence in early Judaism; however, his lexicographical analysis stands out in terms of its thoroughness and precision. Newman highlighted the nuance of meaning in connection to glory as divine presence; it is “visible, mobile divine presence,” that is, associated with both mobility and visibility.⁴⁸ Newman explored Paul's use of the language of glory in view of the background of the use of glory as divine presence in connection to Paul's references to visions of Christ (1 Cor 9:1; Gal 1:12, 16) and glory in connection to Christ in 2 Corinthians 3-4 and 1 Cor 2:8. Centrally, Newman argued that Paul conceptualized his experience of Christ as a theophany (a “Christophany”) that parallels that the appearance of God's glory at Sinai. Newman's argument had implications principally for understanding Paul's Christology. At the same, it thoroughly treated the use of the language of glory as divine presence in early Judaism

⁴⁶ Leenhardt, *The Epistle to the Romans* (trans. Harold Knight; London: Lutterworth, 1961) 100, 132-33, in connection to Rom 3:23 and 5:2.

⁴⁷ Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, 84-85; Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 347.

⁴⁸ Newman, *Paul's Glory-Christology*, 190; see 134-53.

(offering a nuanced account of its meaning and a theory of the development of its usage) and considered this in connection to Paul's letters.

The first focused study on glory in Romans was a 2007 article from Preston Sprinkle. Sprinkle set glory in Romans in relation to *Apocalypse of Moses* and *2 Baruch*. Sprinkle observed that while Adam's loss of glory is explicitly indicated in *Apocalypse of Moses*, neither Paul nor *2 Baruch* refer to Adam's glory.⁴⁹ Sprinkle poses that the loss of glory in *Apoc. Mos.* 20:1-2 and 21:6 signals the loss of immortality, on the basis of the coordination of 21:6 with 14:2 and the interest in immortality in the text.⁵⁰ However, glory in these texts is better read as radiance, in view of the use of the language elsewhere in the text and the reference to being "clothed" with glory like a garment.⁵¹ Sprinkle highlights that *2 Baruch* 49-51 presents transformation into glory as radiance: "Their splendor will then be glorified by transformation, and the shape of their face will be changed into the light of their beauty."⁵² When it comes to Romans, however, Sprinkle holds that Paul with reference to glory for humans has in view a "divine way of being" and especially the sense immortality.⁵³

A related account of the language appeared in the 2009 study of Ben Blackwell. Blackwell highlights the diversity in previous interpreters of glory in Romans and determines to

⁴⁹ Sprinkle, "The Afterlife in Romans," 231-32.

⁵⁰ Ibid., 206. *Apoc. Mos.* 20:1-2: "Why have you done this to me that I have been estranged from the glory with which I was clothed (ἀπηλλοτριώθην ἐκ τῆς δόξης μου, ἧς ἤμην ἐνδεδυμένη)?"

Apoc. Mos. 21:6: "Why have you wrought destruction among us (τί κατηργάσω ἐν ἡμῖν)? You have estranged me from the glory of God (ἀπηλλοτριώθην ἐκ τῆς δόξης μου, ἧς ἤμην ἐνδεδυμένη)?"

Apoc. Mos. 14:6: "Why have you wrought destruction among us (τί κατηργάσω ἐν ἡμῖν) and brought great wrath upon us, which is death ruling over our race?"

⁵¹ Thus, Andrew T. Lincoln, *Paradise Now and Not Yet* (SNTSMS 43; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981) 43. Cf. 18:5, "seeing" the "great glory around" the tree (ὄψει δόξαν μεγάλην περὶ αὐτοῦ); 33:2, the "four radiant eagles" of which none can "tell of their glory or see their faces (εἰπεῖν τὴν δόξαν αὐτῶν οὔτε ἰδεῖν τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτῶν)."

⁵² Sprinkle, "The Afterlife in Romans," 208-11.

⁵³ Ibid., 216-29.

understand the language in view of the “literary context of the letter as a whole.”⁵⁴ Blackwell refers to glory as part of Paul’s honor discourse. Blackwell observes that glory often appears in coordination with terms for honor and dishonor (τιμή, ἀτιμία), as in Rom 2:7 and 10, where Paul says that for those who do good, there is “glory and honor and immortality...glory and honor and peace” (see also 9:21-24).⁵⁵ Blackwell also notes settings where glory appears alongside terms for immortality (as in Rom 2:7), life, corruption, and destruction (φθαρτός, ἀφθαρσία, φθορά, ἀπώλεια; 1:23, 8:21, 9:22-23). Blackwell concludes that glory in Romans means “honour and/or incorruption depending on its context.”⁵⁶ When God is the object of glory, the term carries the sense honor, while when Paul refers to glory for humans the term refers to both honor and incorruption. Blackwell affirms the allusion to Adam in Rom 3:23. Neither Blackwell nor Sprinkle weigh their account of glory as immortality against the use of the language in the broader context. Glory could carry the sense honor, as in Blackwell’s reading, but immortality and incorruption were not established senses of the language.

In a 2011 study, Harrison seeks to determine how the audience would have understood what Paul says with the language of glory.⁵⁷ Harrison’s study sets glory in Romans in relation to the “Roman ideal of glory” as represented in texts from Cicero, Sallust, Tacitus, the *Sciopianic elogia*, and certain honorific inscriptions.⁵⁸ Harrison also considers the use of glory in Jewish scriptural contexts.⁵⁹ Harrison sees Paul affirming and countering certain views related to glory in the ancient world, such as that “Paul interacts with the ‘glory’ traditions touching on the

⁵⁴ Blackwell, “Immortal Glory and the Problem of Death,” 286, 292.

⁵⁵ Ibid., 293-94

⁵⁶ Ibid., 298.

⁵⁷ Harrison, “Paul and the Roman Ideal of Glory,” 203-05, 254.

⁵⁸ Ibid., 205-32.

⁵⁹ Ibid., 232-42.

pilgrimage of the Gentiles in a way that would have surprised his Jewish contemporaries”⁶⁰ and that “in contrast to the ‘realised eschatology’ of the Roman ruler...Paul emphasizes the gravity of the sufferings of the present creation.”⁶¹ In a second study, “Paul and Ancient Civic Ethics,” Harrison explores the use of glory in Paul with a view to understanding the logic of the texts. The focus on honor and shame remains: Harrison holds that Paul “endorses the legitimacy of the human quest for glory” in Rom 2:7 and 10 with references to “glory, honor, and immortality,” “glory, honor, and peace” for those who do good.⁶² Harrison holds that Paul focuses on the glory of God rather than on the “quest for immortality through the surpassing of ancestral honour.”⁶³

The study of Donald Berry follows the tendency of affirming the presence of Adam with Paul’s use of the language of glory. Berry defines glory for humans in Rom 1:23, 2:7, 10, 3:23, 5:2, 8:17-30, 9:4, and 9:23 as “their sharing in God’s nature, his divine life and all that characterizes it.”⁶⁴ Further, Berry follows the reading of Dunn and Wright in seeing Paul referring, with the language of glory, to the “task of dominion over creation God gave to his image-bearers,” in relation to which Berry appeals to Gen 1:26-28 and OG Ps 8:6-9.⁶⁵ Berry employs the image of reflecting in relation to glory, which is based on the idea of glory as light that may be reflected in a mirror.⁶⁶ Berry holds this idea of reflecting with regard both to glory for humans and glory with God as the object. Thus to “glorify God” (1:21) is to “live one’s life in such a way that one’s life reflects the truth about God that has been made known to them.”⁶⁷

⁶⁰ Ibid., 260.

⁶¹ Harrison, “Paul and the Roman Ideal of Glory,” 267.

⁶² Idem., “Paul and Ancient Civic Ethics,” 107

⁶³ Ibid., 108.

⁶⁴ Berry, *Glory in Romans*, 37; 17, 21-23, 53, 59, *passim*.

⁶⁵ Ibid., 19, 114-35.

⁶⁶ Ibid., 17, 32.

⁶⁷ Ibid., 15.

Haley Jacob, in her 2018 study, follows and expands on, in many respects, the previous analyses of Dunn, Wright, and Berry. Jacob examines the use of the language of glory in the LXX in view of the meaning of Hebrew כבוד, the term that δόξα, with certain other terms, consistently rendered in the Greek translation of the Jewish scriptures.⁶⁸ Jacob highlights the use of the language of glory to mean “honor” in scriptural settings and holds that δόξα is “honor or status associated with character, power, or wealth.” Jacob appeals to texts where glory appears in association with humans and means honor and to honor (i.e., LXX Gen 45:13; OG Ben Sira 47:11; OG 1 Chron 29:25; OG Ps 8:6; OG Dan 1:20; 1 Macc 10:65).⁶⁹ In these settings, Jacob notes, glory is associated with “the person’s status as king, ruler, or person of authority.” (48, 50). These meanings are also in play, in Jacob’s account, in OG Daniel and 1 Enoch. These observations are key for Jacob’s reading of glory in Romans, since Jacob holds that Paul uses glory with reference to human in Romans to mean “Adam/humanity’s honor or power associated with their status as the Creator’s representatives called to steward his creation”; that the human experience of glory in Romans is to “be exalted to a new status, one of honor associated with a representative reign over creation.”⁷⁰ Jacob, like Dunn, Wright, and Berry, appeals in this connection to Gen 1:26 and OG Ps 8:6-7, and Jacob finds these texts behind Paul’s use of the language of glory in 1 Corinthians 15, Phil 3:20-21, and Romans 1-8.

Jacob seeks to diminish the prevalence of the use of the language of glory to mean splendor and divine presence, against the references to this meaning in previous interpretation of Romans. Jacob is right to highlight the meaning “honor” in scriptural contexts, which interpreters have diminished as the “profane,” and by this they mean non-biblical, use of the

⁶⁸ Discussed in chapter 2.

⁶⁹ Jacob, *Conformed to the Image*, 47-52.

⁷⁰ Ibid., 117, 121.

language.⁷¹ On the other hand, Jacob is unfair in characterizing the use of the language in Jewish literature. In the first place, Jacob reduces the significance of the meaning splendor and divine presence in relation to settings where God's presence is in view, limiting this to a symbolism for God's honor or power.⁷² Newman showed that the meaning of glory in these settings is not honor or status but visible, mobile divine presence.⁷³ Second, Jacob construes the language of glory as loaded with the meaning power and authority where it is better to understand the vocabulary simply in terms of honor and honoring. For example, she cites OG Dan 1:20, "The king glorified them (καὶ ἐδόξασεν αὐτοὺς ὁ βασιλεὺς) and appointed them in the affairs in his whole kingdom (καὶ ἀνέδειξεν ἐν πράγμασιν ἐν πάσῃ τῇ ἑαυτοῦ βασιλείᾳ)," and states, "Glorification here unequivocally means one thing: exaltation to a status of power and authority in which the person rules or governs."⁷⁴ However, δοξάζω here simply means to honor, to praise, and the further statement ("appointed them in the affairs of the whole kingdom") is what indicates that the group of Jews were given authority in the king's court.⁷⁵

⁷¹ See A. J. Vermeulen, *The semantic development of Gloria in early-Christian Latin* (Nijmegen: Dekker & van de Vegt, 1956) 1-4, 139.

⁷² Jacob, *Conformed to the Image*, 36-37. Jacob lists, i.e., LXX Exod 16:10, 24:16, 17, 33:18, 19, 22, 40:34, 35; Lev 9:6; Num 12:8, 14:10; OG 1 Kgs 8:11; 2 Macc 2:8. Jacob defines these as "God's honor or status associated with his character or power...manifested in (symbolized by) splendor/theophany."

⁷³ See examples cited in Newman, *Paul's Glory-Christology*, 24, 148, 190, discussed again in chapter 2. The glory of the Lord is coordinated with movement and appearance terminology (20-24). The glory of the Lord "fills" (πληρόω; Exod 40:34, 35, Num 14:21; 1 Kgs 8:11; 2 Chron 5:14, 7:1, 2, Ezek 10:4, 43:5; 44:4) "comes down" (καταβαίνω; OG Exod 24:16; cf. "fire" in 2 Chron 7:3), "passes by" (παρέρχομαι; Exod 33:22) "rises" (ἀναβαίνω; Ezek 9:3, 11:23) "enters" (εἰσέρχομαι; Ezek 43:4) and "departs" (ἀποικίζω; 1 Sam 4:22; μετοικίζω; Hos 10:6). The glory of the Lord is "seen" and "appears" (ὁράω; Exod 16:7, 10; Lev 9:6, 23; Num 14:10, 22; Ps 16:5; Isa 40:5; Ezek 3:23; *Ps. Sol.* 17:31) and has the appearance of fire (Exod 24:17; 2 Chron 7:3) and a rainbow-like brightness (Ezek 1:28).

⁷⁴ Jacob, *Conformed to the Image*, 58.

⁷⁵ Concerning OG Dan 7:14, Jacob states (Ibid., 58), "The One Like a Son of Man in Daniel 7:14 clearly is given glory understood as power, authority, honor associated with a status of rule." But, glory is not given to the son of man in 7:14. The claim is that honor serves the son of man (so, NETS): "And authority was given to him (αἱ ἐδόθη αὐτῷ ἐξουσία) and all the nations of the earth according to their generations, and all honor was serving him (πᾶσα δόξα αὐτῷ λατρεύουσα), and his authority is an everlasting authority..."

Jacob holds that in Romans 8 Paul works with the idea of “vocational participation of believers in the Firstborn Son’s honorable status of power and authority over creation.”⁷⁶ Jacob holds that this, rather than the transformation of the body, is the emphasis of Romans 8. The focus, in her words, is on “sonship, a wholistic identity rather than corporeal identity.”⁷⁷ However, to pose this is to overlook the prevailing interest in σῶμα throughout Romans 1-8 and specifically in 8:1-30.⁷⁸ As Paul states in Rom 8:23: “We groan inwardly while we wait for adoption, the redemption of our bodies (τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν τοῦ σώματος ἡμῶν).” Further, the interest is in bodily transformation, as well, in Phil 3:20-21 and 1 Cor 15:35-58, texts that Jacob cites as presenting the idea of “vocational participation.” Philippians 3:20-21 refers to the “body of humiliation” (σῶμα τῆς ταπεινώσεως) and the “body of glory” (σῶμα τῆς δόξης). 1 Corinthians 15:35-58 answers the question of the nature of the body, posed in 15:35: “How are the dead raised? With what kind of body do they come (ποιῶ δὲ σώματι ἔρχονται)?” These, together with Romans 8, are the central texts for Jacob’s understanding of the experience of glory for humans in Paul, and they do not present the idea of vocational participation.⁷⁹

Two further recent focused studies must be noted here, which, though having their own interpretive emphases, parallel each other in that they read glory in Romans as in certain cases meaning divine presence. The 2014 study of Beverly Gaventa understands the glory of God in Rom 1:23, 3:23, 5:2, and 8:18 as referring to “God’s own glory,” and specifically “God’s

⁷⁶ Ibid., 263.

⁷⁷ Ibid., 252.

⁷⁸ See σῶμα in Rom 1:24, 6:6, 12, 7:24, 8:10, 11, 13, 23.

⁷⁹ More on this in chapters 3-5. Jacob seeks to place 2 Corinthians 3-4, with its reference to transformation in divine presence, to the side in understanding glory in Romans 8, given that for her Romans 8 attests to the idea of vocational participation while 2 Corinthians 3-4 does not (Ibid., 168-69; 261). In my account, Romans 8 does not refer to vocational participation, and 2 Corinthians 3-4, Phil 3:20-21, 1 Cor 15:35-58, and Rom 8:17-30 attest to the same dynamic, that is, transformation into glory in divine presence.

presence as it triumphs powerfully over God's own enemies, most especially the enemies named Sin and Death."⁸⁰ Gaventa denies the allusion to Adam with glory in Romans and coordinates glory with the dynamics of cosmological conflict she detects throughout the letter.⁸¹ In support of her account, Gaventa cites texts in which glory refers to divine presence (Exod 24:16, 40:34, Lev 9:23, Psa 56:6, Ezek 11:23) and texts where the glory is connected to God amid conflict and military imagery (i.e., OG Isa 2:10, Bar 4:5-5:9, 1QM IV, 6, 8; Luke 9:26). Gaventa holds that Paul's use of the language of glory of God should be understood in terms of the "apocalyptic interpretation of the gospel" present in the letters.⁸²

Sigurd Grindheim likewise finds reference to divine presence with Paul's references to the glory of God.⁸³ Grindheim begins by providing extensive argumentation against the Adam reading and principally the contextual work represented in Jacob Jervell. Grindheim notes texts of the DSS that refer to Adam's glory (1QS IV, 23; CD-A III, 20; 1QH^a IV, 15) but, against Jervell and other contextual analyses, he holds that "it is unwarranted to read the concepts of God's glory and Adam's creation in God's image into these texts."⁸⁴ Moreover, Grindheim holds, concerning 4Q504 VIII, 4, "[...Adam,] our [fa]ther, you fashioned in the image of [your] glory," that the text does not attribute God's glory to Adam; instead, "the glory of God is the model according to which Adam was fashioned."⁸⁵ Rather than finding reference to Adam's glory in Romans, Grindheim holds, in view of the use of the language in the LXX, that glory throughout Romans refers to the presence of God.⁸⁶ With respect to Rom 2:7 and 10, Grindheim

⁸⁰ Gaventa, "The 'Glory of God,'" 36, also 31-32, 34.

⁸¹ Ibid., 34-36.

⁸² Ibid., 40.

⁸³ Grindheim, "A Theology of Glory," 451-65.

⁸⁴ Ibid., 453-57, 455.

⁸⁵ Ibid., 456. See also Van Kooten, *Paul's Anthropology in Context*, 21-22, "The fragment, however, talks only of fashioning Adam 'in the likeness of God's glory', not as its likeness."

⁸⁶ Grindheim, "A Theology of Glory," 457-62.

holds that to “seek after glory and honor and immortality” contains reference to divine presence and that to seek these things is “to look for God and yearn for God’s personal presence.”⁸⁷

Among recent focused studies those from Gaventa and Grindheim have the most in common with the present analysis when it comes to reading texts that refer to glory for humans (1:23, 3:23, 5:2, 8:17-30). On the other hand, these studies leave crucial dimensions unexplored. Grindheim and Gaventa do not incorporate their readings of Rom 3:23 and elsewhere with Romans 8, and they do not consider glory in Romans 1. Gaventa’s account is praiseworthy in seeking to integrate her reading of glory as divine presence with other features in the letter. She sees glory of God as divine presence as related to the theme of cosmological conflict. I also seek to integrate a reading of glory with the other elements of Romans, however Gaventa and I disagree about the broader dynamic in Romans. Gaventa understands this in terms of cosmological conflict, while I understand this in terms of impurity and the loss of divine presence and the purifying agency of Jesus as making divine presence possible. Thus, both Grindheim and Gaventa plausibly, in my view, read the language in certain instances as “divine presence,” but there is further work to do in integrating the language of glory as divine presence with the other themes in the letter.

6. Conclusion

Here the strands of the discussion may be drawn together. I highlighted, in connection to the interpretation of language of glory to God, the readings honor and praise to God. I noted the nontraditional readings of George Boobyer and Donald Berry. I highlighted, in addition, that there is room to explore the conceptual framework at play in Paul’s references to glory to God,

⁸⁷ Ibid., 462-65.

and that interpretations proposing a framework of divine patronage and benefaction are worth further consideration in relation to Paul. I noted the diversity and lack of rigor among past interpretations of glory for humans. I highlighted, further, in this connection, the development and features of the Adam reading as represented in Rückert, Jervell, Hooker, and Dunn. Further, I noted the honor and shame/sociological readings of glory in Moxnes and Jewett. These studies provided the backdrop for those recent focused studies of glory in Romans. These studies have posited different definitions of glory, some of which are not grounded in the meaning of glory in antiquity, whether in general Greco-Roman or specifically Jewish and Christian usage. On the other hand, certain of these readings are grounded in the semantic and conceptual value of the language.

This account of the history of interpretation is illuminating for our purposes not only because it sets up the significance of future scholarly discussion of glory in Paul's letters but also because in many cases it flags up the issues that need to be addressed in providing an account of the topic. Past interpretation has drawn into view the connection of glory with an interpretive motif related to Adam; the connection of glory with the discourse of honor and shame; the connection of glory with divine presence; the need to examine Paul's glory language in view of its immediate context; the need to consider glory in relation to other major themes in the letter; and so on. Treatments of the historical context in past interpretation prove to be a guide for future analysis: we have, for instance, Moxnes and Jewett to thank for drawing attention to the connection of glory with the discourse of honor and shame; Harrison, for drawing attention to the specifically "Roman context of *gloria*"; and many past interpreters, including Jervell and Dunn, for drawing attention to the language of glory in connection to Adam. In the next chapter, I

consider the context of the use of glory language, for which I draw on past accounts in many cases, but in other cases must supplement these accounts.

As part of our method, surveying one set of contextual materials to the exclusion of the others is ruled out as improper; this study seeks to incorporate the range of semantic and conceptual angles that might be deemed relevant for understanding glory language (as much as this can be achieved). Thus, in the next chapter we survey the meaning of glory from a semantic perspective and also consider the discourses in which the language of glory functioned. We build on past accounts of these issues and in certain cases must supplement these past accounts, and later consider Paul's letters in view of the findings. To this analysis of the contextual material, then, we turn in the next chapter.

2. Glory in the Ancient World

In this chapter we consider the context of the use of the language of glory in the ancient world. The Greek language of glory, δόξα, had wide usage in the parlance of Greco-Roman antiquity. It could denote “opinion,” or the opinion others have of one, thus “reputation,” “honor.” It could also, in specifically Jewish and Christian idiom in the first century CE, denote “radiance” and “divine presence.” In addition to its semantic range, the language of glory had specific conceptual associations that should be noted in examining the literature of antiquity, Paul’s letters and the other documents that make up the New Testament included. Recognizing this, this chapter proceeds in two main parts, with the first addressing the semantic value of the language of glory and the second addressing the conceptual associations of the language. In connection to the former topic, the first section comprises a lexicographical analysis of glory. Regarding the latter topic, the second section considers discourses within which the language of glory played a role. It is clear from the data that conceptual conventions related to the language of glory developed and, given our methodological foundations and our interest in understanding Paul’s communicative intentions, it is useful to consider these.

On this note, one will perceive certain aspects of the following discussion that should be remarked on in advance. First, there will be a noticeable emphasis on the Jewish and Christian literature when discussing both the semantic range of glory and the discourses in which glory fit. This is due to the clear importance of the Jewish and Christian theological context for understanding Paul, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, the recognition that in certain interesting ways Jewish and Christian sources attest to conventions related to the language of

glory that are distinct to their specific linguistic contexts.¹ It should be clarified here, however, that the non-Jewish and non-Christian conventions related to the language are also considered as potentially relevant context for understanding Paul. Second, certain discourses are treated less extensively than others; in particular, the discourse of honor and shame and the discourse of primeval humanity receive less attention in this discussion. This is due to the large amount of scholarly attention already devoted to these topics. Conversely, the discourses of cultic purity and divine presence and eschatological expectation are considered in more detail, given that the language of glory is strongly attested in these discourses (within the Jewish and Christian linguistic contexts) and that, in view of the secondary literature, there is further room to explore these discourses in their connection to the language of glory.

First, then, we consider the semantic range of the language through traditional lexicographical analysis. This is related to and leads directly into a consideration of the discourses, the second part of the chapter.

1. The Semantic Range of Glory²

1.1 Δόξα as Expectation, Opinion

¹ To cite one example, in Jewish and Christian sources the language of glory has a clear and strong association with eschatological discourse, whereas in non-Jewish and non-Christian sources the language of glory does not bear this association.

² This discussion relies on many previous lexicographical analyses. LSJ, *TDNT*; BDAG; *TLNT*; *DGE*; Helmut Kittel, *Die Herrlichkeit Gottes: Studien zu Geschichte und Wesen eines Neutestamentlichen Begriffs* (Gießen: Alfred Töpelmann, 1934); Newman, *Paul's Glory Christology*, 17-153; T. Muraoka, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint* (Louvain; Peeters, 2009); Chibici-Revneanu, *Herrlichkeit*, 335-510; Jörg Frey, "The Use of δόξα in Paul and John as Shaped by the Septuagint," in *The Reception of Septuagint Words in Jewish-Hellenistic Christian Literature* (eds. Eberhard Bons, Ralph Brucker, and Jan Joosten; WUNT II/367; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014) 85-103.

A meaning of δόξα and δοξάζω with early attestation is the sense “expectation,” “to expect.”³ A common phrase was παρὰ δόξαν, “contrary to expectation,” which appears regularly in Josephus.⁴ Interestingly, however, “expectation” and “to expect” are not attested in the Greek translation of the Jewish scriptures. The nominal form δόξα could denote “opinion” or “belief,” as in Plutarch 404B, “Neither of these, young friend, goes counter to reason if only we hold correct and uncontaminated beliefs about the gods (περὶ τοῦ θεοῦ δόξας).”⁵ In many cases δόξα as opinion has a negative association, thus “mere opinion, conjecture.”⁶ Plato set δόξα in opposition to ἐπιστήμη and reality.⁷ Philo referred to ψευδὴς δόξα and κεναὶ δόξαι and set δόξα in opposition to truth.⁸ The verb form could mean “to think,” “to imagine,” “to consider.”⁹ In connection to the link with perception, the nominal form could mean “illusion,” “vision,” as something stemming from the imagination.¹⁰

³ So, *DGE*, s.v. δόξα, δοξάζω: “esperanza, expectativa,” “esperar.” Δόξα: Homer, *Od.* 11.344; Sophocles, *Phil.* 1463; Pindar, *Ol.* 10.63, ἐν δόξῃ θέμενος εὖχος; Herodotus 7.203; *POxy.* 1873.7. Δοξάζω: Euripides, *Orest.* 711; Sophocles, *Phil.* 545, “I had met them, not expecting to” (δοξάζων μὲν οὐ); Polybius, *Hist.* 3.68.1.

⁴ Herodotus 1.79; Thucydides 3.93.1; Josephus, *J.W.* 1.95, 614, 3.289; *Ant.* 2.280, 3.210, 5.40, 15.255; cited in Ceslas Spicq, “δόξα, δοξάζω, συνδοξάζω,” *TWNT* 362n2.

⁵ Aeschylus, *Pers.* 28; Plato, *Gorg.* 472E; Achilles Tatius, *Intr. Arat.* 19, “[he] is of the opinion” (ἡς δόξης ἐστὶ); Josephus, *J.W.* 1.375, 2.154, 160; *Ant.* 2.286; 4.147; Isa 11:2, “He will not judge according to popular opinion or according to a report (οὐ κατὰ τὴν δόξαν κρινεῖ οὐδὲ κατὰ τὴν λαλιάν); Ben Sira 8:14, “Do not go to law with a judge, because they will judge him according to his opinion”; Muraoka, “the court will pass a judgment in line with what thinks is right,” though these may fit under 1.2 (so NETS).

⁶ Herodotus 8.132; Thucydides 1.32.5, 5.105.3; Josephus, *J.W.* 2.169; Isocrates, *De pace* 8:8, speaking “by guess (ὥς δόξῃ).”

⁷ *Theaet.* 187B; 161E; *Rep.* 534C: “not by reference to what is generally believed, but by reference to reality (μὴ κατὰ δόξαν ἀλλὰ κατ’ οὐσίαν).” But, Plato refers to ἀληθὴς δόξα (*Phileb.* 36C; *Theaet.* 202B). For δόξα as opinion in philosophical texts, see Chibici-Revneanu, *Herrlichkeit*, 337-40.

⁸ *Cher.* 9, 66, 71, 83; *Post.* 13, 52; *Drunkennes* 36, 38, 70, 144; *Alleg. Interp.* 2.56-57; *Spec. Laws* 2.244, 3.164. Cited in Spicq, 366-67n.25-27.

⁹ Plato, *Rep.* 588B: “reputed to be just” (δοξαζομένῳ δὲ δικαίῳ); *Theaet.* 189C, “he always holds an opinion (ἀεὶ δοξάζει);” Philostratus, *Vit. Apoll.* 6.3; Isocrates, *Bus.* 26; Thucydides 3.45; “to believe,” Plato, *Rep.* 476D; *Gorg.* B11A.3; Lucian, *Merc. cond.* 11: “No one would receive you if you were considered unacceptable (δόξαντα εἶναι ἀδόκιμον).

¹⁰ Aeschylus, *Ag.* 275, “I wouldn’t accept the mere fancy of a slumbering mind (οὐ δόξαν ἄν λάβοιμι βριζούσης φρενός);” Euripides, *Rhes.* 780; Philostratus, *Vit. Apoll.* 1.23, “vision in a dream” (δόξα ἐνυπνίου).

1.2 Δόξα as Reputation, Honor, Renown

Δόξα also could refer to the opinion others have of a person or thing. This could bear a neutral sense, thus reputation or estimation,¹¹ and in handful of cases denotes bad reputation.¹² But, in most settings the term signals good reputation, thus the translations “honor,” “distinction,” “glory.” The term often appeared in coordination with other terms for good social standing and wealth.¹³ Philo referred to “gold and silver, glory and honor and powers (χρυσὸς ἄργυρος δόξα τιμαὶ ἀρχαί).”¹⁴ In like manner, the noun form appears with a dative and refers to honor attributed to an object, as in Isocrates, *Ep.* 8.6: “to contribute honor and glory to their city (τιμὴν καὶ δόξαν αὐτῇ).”¹⁵ The person who had δόξα could be said to be resplendent: there was an association of glory as honor with radiance, though in common use the term did not denote splendor.¹⁶ Δοξάζω with the sense “to honor” appears in common use, as in Polybius 6.53.10,

¹¹ Solon 13.4, “good reputation from all people (ἀνθρώπων αἰεὶ δόξαν ἔχειν ἀγαθὴν);” Thucydides 2.11.2; 4 Macc 5:18, 6:18. Perhaps also Isa 11:2, Ben Sira 8:14.

¹² Demosthenes, *Lept.* 10; Polybius 15.22.3.

¹³ Plato, *Apol.* 29D-E, “Are you...not ashamed to care for the acquisition of wealth and for reputation and honor (πλεῖστα καὶ δόξης καὶ τιμῆς);” Strabo, *Geogr.* 1.2; Aristotle, *Rhet.* 1.5, 1.6; Demosthenes, *Lept.* 155; 2 *Olynth.* 15-16; 3 *Olynth.* 3.24; Xenophon, *Memor.* 3.12.4: “They do good for their country and earn gratitude, great distinction, and very high honors (δόξαν μεγάλην κτῶνται καὶ τιμῶν καλλίστων);” Diodorus Siculus, *Library*, 9.26; Thucydides, 2.64.5, δόξα paired with λαμπρότης; Gen 31:16; Exod 28:2, 28:40, 2 Macc 5:16, 15:13; OG Ps 28:1; Dan 2:37; Lucian, *Rhet. praec.* 6, *Wis. Nigr.* 4; Cassius Dio 37.22.3; Heb 3:3.

¹⁴ *Alleg. Interp.* 2.107; *Cherub.* 117; *Worse* 33, 122, 157; *Giants* 15, 36.

¹⁵ Also Plutarch 414B; Josephus, *Ant.* 1.54, 2.268; 1 Chron 16:28; 2 Chron 1:12; OG Ps 95:8; Prov 26:8; Luke 14:10.

¹⁶ Pindar, *Pyth.* 11.45; Thucydides 2.64.5, “For hatred does not last long, but the splendour of the moment and the after-glory (ἡ δὲ παραντίκα τε λαμπρότης καὶ ἐς τὸ ἔπειτα δόξα αἰείμνηστος) are left in everlasting remembrance”; Plutarch 345F, “There is reflected from the men of action upon the men of letters an image of another’s glory, which shines again there (ἀναλάμπει δόξης εἰδωλὸν ἀλλοτρίας ἐμφαινομένης), since the deed is seen, as in a mirror, through the agency of their words”; 100D, “glory more resplendent” (δόξα λαμπροτέρα); cf. 409B, “affluence, splendor, and honor (εὐπορίαν καὶ λαμπρότητα καὶ τιμὴν); Philo, *Dreams* 2.42, the dreamer “seeks vain glory (τῆς κενῆς δόξης), deeming it as a possession of high importance and splendor (λαμπροτάτου) and advantage to human life. Cf. *Planting* 171. John Lendon, *Empire of Honour: The Art of Government in the Ancient World* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1997) 274: “To the Roman mind *gloria* shines” (linking *gloria* ≈ δόξα, 278).

“men renowned for their excellence (ἐπ’ ἀρετῇ δεδοξασμένων),”¹⁷ but this meaning appears much more frequently in Jewish scriptural idiom and authors influenced by scripture.¹⁸

Accordingly, whereas in general parlance the verbs τιμάω and ἐπαινέω were normally used to refer to praising deities, δοξάζω as to praise and honor God is common in Jewish and Christian sources.¹⁹ The construction “give glory to God” was a distinctly scriptural idiom,²⁰ and the noun form δόξα as honor to God appears in Jewish and Christian liturgical formulae.²¹

1.3 Δόξα as Divine Presence

Glory as divine presence developed on account of the use of the language of glory in the Greek translation of the Jewish scriptures.²² The Hebrew term כבוד, in scriptural idiom, was associated with and in many cases denoted divine presence, and δόξα translated all but 14 of the

¹⁷ See *DGE* s.v. δοξάζω II.1.

¹⁸ OG 1 Kgs 2:29, 30, 15:30; Jdt 12:13; Mal 1:6; Ben Sira 10:30, 31, 24:12; 1 Macc 11:51, 14:39; Matt 6:2; Luke 4:15

¹⁹ Exod 15:2; Lev 10:3; OG 1 Kgs 2:30; Judg 9:9; Ben Sira 3:20; OG Ps 21:24, 49:15, 23, cf. 70:8, “I will sing your praise (ὑμνήσω τὴν δόξαν σου),” 85:12; Isa 25:1, 43:23, “glorified me with your sacrifices (ἐν ταῖς θυσίαις σου ἐδόξασάς με); *Ps. Sol.* 10:7, 17:5; Mark 2:12; Matt 5:16; Luke 13:13, 17:15, 18:43; Acts 11:18; 1 Pet 4:16.

²⁰ With variants “to the Lord,” “to my/your name.” Josh 7:19; 1 Kgdms 6:5; OG Ps 67:35, 113:9; Isa 42:1; Jer 13:16; 1 Chron 16:28, 29; 2 Chron 30:8; Mal 2:2; Jonah 7:19; Wis 10:14; 1 Esd 9:8; 4 Macc 1:12; Rev 11:13, 19:7; *Apoc. Mos.* 4:3, “we will give glory and sacrifice to God (δώσωμεν δόξαν καὶ θυσίαν τῷ θεῷ);” *T. Job* 14:3, 16:7; *Jos. Asen.* 20.7-8; 3 (Greek) *Bar.* 17:3-4; Justin, *Dial.* 65.6.4.

²¹ 4 Macc 18:24; *Apoc. Sed.* 16:7; Gal 1:5; Rom 16:27; 2 Tim 4:18; 2 Pet 3:18, Rev 1:6, 5:13; Heb 13:21; *Did.* 9.1-3, 10.4; *1 Clem.* 32:4, 45:7; *Diog.* 12:9.

²² On the phenomenon of δόξα used in the LXX and the semantic development that occurred as a result of this, see H. Kittel, *Die Herrlichkeit Gottes*, 31-67; G. Kittel, H. Hegerrmann, “δόξα,” *Exegetisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, 1980, 1.832-41; Ceslas Spicq, “δόξα, δοξάζω, συνδοξάζω,” *TLNT* 1.364-66 (364: “The semantic evolution of *doxa* is probably the most extraordinary in the Bible”); Newman, *Paul’s Glory-Christology*, 134-53; Chibici-Revneanu, *Herrlichkeit*, 354-457; Frey, “The Use of δόξα,” 86-93. There has been extensive discussion over why the translators used δόξα to render כבוד, on which see the overview in Newman, 134-53. The terms overlapped on the meaning “honor,” which could explain the initial choice (Frey, “The Use of δόξα” 90-91). The meaning light for δόξα is not attested in pre-Septuagintal Greek (Kittel, *Die Herrlichkeit Gottes*, 23-26; Chibici-Revneanu, *Herrlichkeit*, 343-44). But see the association with splendor in 1.2.

roughly 200 occurrences of כבוד in the MT.²³ Thus δόξα as “visible, mobile divine presence” entered Jewish and eventually Christian parlance.²⁴ The δόξα κυρίου/θεοῦ took up space and moved.²⁵ The glory was visible; it “appeared,” and had the appearance of fire and a rainbow.²⁶ In its use as a technical term for divine presence δόξα parallels the terms נֶשֶׁם/ὄνομα, רִוּחַ/πνεῦμα, and the Rabbinic שכינה,²⁷ though δόξα bears its own associations, particularly the association with bright visibility.

²³ Gen 49:6; 1 Sam. 4:21; Isa 5:13, 10:18, 11:10, 14:18, 22:18, 61:6; Ezek 23:41, 31:18; Nah 2:10; Ps 4:3, 16:9, Prov 26:1. For כבוד and divine presence, see Newman, *Paul's Glory Christology*, 18-24; Chibici-Revnanu, *Herrlichkeit*, 356-58. Newman, 152, “A semantic change took place where δόξα acquired the technical meanings of יהוה כבוד.”

²⁴ Quoting Newman, *Paul's Glory Christology*, 190. See LXX Exod 16:7, 10, 24:16, 17, 29:43, 33:18, 19, 22, 40:34, 35; Lev 9:6, 23; Num 12:8, 14:10, 21, 22, 16:19, 17:7, 20:6; Deut 5:24; OG Ps 16:15, 25:8, 28:9, 62:3, 84:10, “that glory might dwell in our land,” 101:16, 17, 105:20, 112:4, 137:5; 1 Kgdms 4:22; 3 Kgdms 8:11; OG 2 Chron 2:5, 5:13, 14, 7:1, 2, 3; Isa 2:10, 19, 21, 6:1, 3, 24:15, 26:10, 35:2, 40:5, 58:8, 60:1-2, 60:13, 66:18; Ezek 3:12, 23; 8:4, 9:3; 11:22, 23; 39:21; 43:2, 4, 44:4; Jdt 9:8; Tob 12:15, 13:16; 2 Macc 2:8; 3 Macc 2:9, 14, 16; Wis 7:25, 9:10; Pr Azar 31; Ben Sira 17:13; 36:19, 49:8, 12; *Pss. Sol.* 2:5, 19, 11:6, 17:31; Hos 10:5; Hag 2:7; Mic 5:4; Zech 2:9; Bar 5:7, 9; *I En.* 9:4, 14:20; Josephus, *Ant.* 8.106; Luke 2:9; John 1:14, 11:40, 12:41; Acts 7:55; Heb 1:3, 2:10; 1 Pet 4:14, 5:10; 2 Pet 1:17; Rev 15:8, 21:11, 23; Titus 2:13; 3 (Greek) *Bar.* 4:17, 6:13, 7:2, 5, 11:3; *T. Levi* 18:5, 6; *Barn.* 3:4; *I Clem.* 17:2; *Sib. Or.* 5:427; *Liv. Pro.* 2:19; 4 *Bar.* 3:21, 7:1.

²⁵ The glory “fills” the tabernacle and temple (πληρώω: Exod 40:34, 35, Num 14:21; 1 Kgs 8:11; 2 Chron 5:14, 7:1, 2; Hag 2:7 Ezek 10:4, 43:5; 44:4; Isa 6:3, “the whole earth is full of his glory”); “passes by” Moses (παρέρχομαι; Exod 33:22), “rises” (ἀναβαίνω; Ezek 9:3, 11:23) “enters” (εἰσέρχομαι; Ezek 43:4) and “departs” (ἀποικίζω; 1 Sam 4:22; μετοικίζω; Hos 10:6). Newman, *Paul's Glory-Christology*, 18-24.

²⁶ The glory of the Lord is “seen” and “appears” (ὁράω; Exod 16:7, 10; Lev 9:6, 23; Num 14:10, 22; OG Ps 16:5; Isa 26:10, 35:2, 40:5, 58:8, 60:1-2, 66:18; Ezek 3:23; *Pss. Sol.* 17:31). Glory as fire and rainbow: Exod 24:17, 2 Chron 7:3; Ezek 24:17). Glory makes Moses’ face shine (Exod 34:29, 30, 35). Bar 5:9: “God will lead Israel with rejoicing in the light of his glory (ἡγήσεται...τῷ φωτὶ τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ).” The glory of God speaks (2 Pet 2:17): “He received honor and glory from God the father as when that voice was conveyed to him by the majestic glory (ὑπὸ τῆς μεγαλοπρεποῦς δόξης), saying, ‘This is my son...’”

²⁷ See also the fire by night and cloud by day; Exod 13:21-22, 14:24: “The Lord looked down from the pillar of fire and cloud.” On spirit, see Nathan MacDonald, “The Spirit of God: A Neglected Conceptualization of the Divine Presence in the Persian Period,” in *Divine Presence and Absence in the Persian Period* (eds. N. MacDonald and I. J. de Hulster; FAT II; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013) 95-120. On *Shekhinah*, see Arnold M. Goldberg, *Untersuchungen über die Vorstellung von der Shekhinah in der frühen rabbinischen Literatur: Talmud und Midrasch* (SJ 5; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1969); cited in Jörg Frey, “God’s Dwelling on Earth: ‘Shekhinah-Theology’ in Revelation 21 and in the Gospel of John,” in *John’s Gospel and Intimations of Apocalyptic* (eds. Catrin H. Williams and Christopher Rowland; London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2013) 87n.25; Ira Chernus, “Visions of God in Merkabah Mysticism,” *JSJ* 13 (1982): 124-46. Glory connected with *Shekhinah*: *T. Ps.-J* Gen 28:12-13, 16, “The Glory of the Lord

1.4 Δόξα as Magnificent Appearance, Radiance

Related to the meaning δόξα as visible divine presence is δόξα as magnificent appearance, “radiance,” “splendor,”²⁸ which appeared in Jewish and Christian idiom.²⁹ Moses’ face is made radiant in the brightness of God’s glory (ἵκε; δεδόξασται/δεδοξασμένη; Exod 34:29, 30, 35). The verb form could mean “to make radiant,” “to make glorious.”³⁰ Glory was connected to the beauty or appearance of clothing or people,³¹ and texts refer to the splendor of stars.³² The radiance of δόξα was associated with the heavenly sphere.³³

1.5 Δόξα and Other Senses?

Past analysis has drawn attention to other meanings δόξα was thought to have picked up on account of its use in the Greek Jewish scriptures, among which, principally, are “wealth” and

stood before him and said to him, ‘I am the Lord’... ‘In truth the glory of the Shekinah of the Lord dwells in this place.’” Translation Maher, *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Genesis*, 100.

²⁸ OG Exod 33:5; Ps 44:14; Hag 2:3, 9; Isa 3:18, 4:2, 5, 60:2, 19; *Let. Aris.* 96, 98; Ben Sira 43:9, 12, 50:5, 7, 11; Bar 4:24; Matt 4:8, 6:29; 19:28; 25:31; Luke 9:32; Acts 22:11; Josephus, *J.W.* 8.267; *A.J.* 8.166; Jude 8; 1 Pet 1:24; 2 Pet 2:10; Rev 18:1; *Barn.* 3:4; *Acts John* 15; 3 *Bar.* 7:5; *T. Job* 43:6; *T. Naph.* 2:8, “to the head he added hair for appearance (πρὸς δόξαν)”; *Apoc. Mos.* 18:5-6, 20:2, 21:6, 33:2; *Sib. Or. Pro.* 76, 78: “Christ our eternal light (τὸ αἰώνιον ἡμῶν φῶς)...the ineffable radiance (τῆς ἀρρήτου δόξης).”

²⁹ See also δόξα as light in magical papyri. E. F. Harrison, “The Use of Doxa in Greek Literature with special reference to the New Testament (PhD. Diss. Pennsylvania 1950; published in: Ann Arbor University Microfilms no. 2871, Michigan).

³⁰ Exod 34:29, 30, 35; Isa 60:13, “The glory of Lebanon will come to you...to make my holy place glorious (δοξάσαι τὸν τόπον τὸν ἁγίον μου)” (see 60:1-3, 19: ἔσται σοι κύριος φῶς αἰώνιον καὶ ὁ θεὸς δόξα σου); *Ps. Sol.* 17:30-31, nations “come from the ends of the earth...to see the glory of the Lord, with which God has glorified her (ἦν ἐδόξασεν αὐτήν ὁ θεός).”

³¹ Kittel, *Die Herrlichkeit*, 61; Boobyer, “Thanksgiving” and the “Glory of God” 11; Walter Bauer, *Das Johannesevangelium* (HNT 6; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul] Siebeck, 1925) 24; *TDNT* 2.243-45; BDAG s.v. δόξα.

³² Ben Sira 43:9, 12, “The splendor of stars is the beauty of heaven (δόξα ἄστρον)”; 1 Cor 15:40; cf. *T. Job.* 43:6, “The splendor of his lantern.”

³³ *Ps. Sol.* 11:7; Luke 9:32; Acts 22:11, “brightness of the light (ἀπὸ τῆς δόξης τοῦ φωτός)”; Jude 8; 2 Pet 2:10; Rev 18:1, “I saw another angel...the earth was made bright with its splendor (ἐφωτίσθη ἐκ τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ)”; Isa 60:2.

“power.”³⁴ These are held to be possible meanings of כבוד,³⁵ and δόξα is thought to have assumed these in the particular settings where כבוד carried these meanings. In addition, δόξα translated the Hebrew עז, “power,” in OG Ps 67:35, Isa 12:2, 45:24, and, further “power” for δόξα is thought to have entered Christian parlance.³⁶ There are a handful of texts where δόξα as power or wealth fit the immediate context.³⁷ On the other hand, in many of the supposed examples, including settings where δόξα translated עז, other, more established senses fit the context just as well or better.³⁸ In view of the social nature of language, which contributed to linguistic change but also to the invariability of language,³⁹ we should be cautious about too-quickly assigning additional meanings to the widely used language of glory (though granting, as we have, that it did indeed gain new meanings through the influence of the Greek Jewish scriptures). Thus, while being open to the possibility that the meanings “power” and “wealth” might have developed in the use of glory, that these indeed were accepted meanings within a linguistic community remains subject to further exploration and argumentation.

³⁴ See Calvin, *Romans*, 222n1; Bauer, *Johannesevangelium*, 24; Boobyer, “Thanksgiving” and the “Glory of God”, 11; H. Kittel, *Die Herrlichkeit Gottes*, 61; G. Kittel, “δοκέω,” TDNT 243-44; BDAG s.v. δόξα. See also δόξα as “soul” (OG Ps 7:6, 29:13, 56:9, 107:2).

³⁵ M. Weinfeld (“כבוד,” in *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament* [Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1984] 4.26) lists, for wealth, Gen 31:1; 1 Kgs 3:13; Isa 2:10, 10:3, 22:24; Ps 49:17; Prov 3:16, 8:18, 22:4; for power, Ps 24:8, 145:11; Job 29:20; Isa 16:14, 21:16.

³⁶ BDAG lists John 2:11, 11:40; Matt 16:27; Mark 8:38; Rom 6:4; Col 1:11.

³⁷ Gen 31:1; Num 27:20, Isa 22:22, 30:27, 30; Ben Sira 17:13b.

³⁸ Honor in OG Ps 67:35 (so NETS); glory as honor alongside αἰνεσις in Isa 12:2; glory as honor parallel to αἰσχύνω in Isa 45:24; Num 12:8, 14:22, divine presence rather than power; OG Ps 23:7, 8, 9, 10, king of glory, honorific; OG Ps 56:6, 12, presence; OG Ps 62:3, beholding radiance; OG Ps 101:16, 17, presence, radiance; Isa 8:7, 16:14, 17:3, 4, 21:16, status represented by wealth, military power; Ezek 39:21, presence; Dan 4:28, 29, 7:14 (NETS, “all honor serving him”); 1 Macc 2:62, honor; Wis 7:25, presence; Matt 16:27, Mark 8:38, radiance; Col 1:11, presence; John 2:11, 11:40: Chibici-Revneanu (*Herrlichkeit*, 413-414), “offenbarung der Herrlichkeit im Wunder (82-92, 157-59). I discuss Rom 6:4 in chapter 5. Chibici-Revneanu (346) holds that δόξα denotes power in Philo, *Spec. Law* 1.45, “By thy glory I understand the powers that keep guard around you (δόξαν δὲ σὴν εἶναι νομίζω τὰς περὶ σὲ δορυφορούσας δυνάμεις).” But see δόξα as radiance in the immediately preceding statement, “I beseech Thee that I may at least see the glory that surrounds Thee (ἰκετεύω δὲ τὴν γοῦν περὶ σὲ δόξαν θεάσασθα)...”

³⁹ On which see Saussure, *Course*, 4, 71-72, 77.

2. The Discourses of Glory

2.1 Honor and Shame

With this survey of the semantic range of the language of glory in view, it is possible to turn to the broader conceptual associations of the language, and for this we here explore the discourses in which glory played a role. The first relevant discourse is the discourse of honor and shame, the features of which are, as is well noted, reflected across literature and non-literary sources from the ancient Mediterranean. Here we survey the broad features of this discourse; interested readers may find much more discussion in the wealth of secondary literature.⁴⁰ As is widely recognized, honor was a central determinant of worth in the early Roman empire.⁴¹ The elite and non-elite alike were concerned with honor,⁴² and both individuals and groups were

⁴⁰ See, from the field of classics, W. V. Harris, *War and Imperialism in Republican Rome 327-70 B.C.* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1979) 17-32; John E. Lendon, *Empire of Honour: The Art of Government in the Roman World* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1997); Gabriella Gustaffson, *Evocatio Deorum: Historical and Mythical Interpretations of Ritualised Conquests in the Expansion of Ancient Rome* (Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis Historia Religionum 16; Uppsala: Uppsala University, 1999); Carlin A. Barton, *Roman Honor: The Fire in the Bones* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001); from the field of biblical studies, Bruce J. Malina, *The New Testament World: Insights from Cultural Anthropology* (3rd ed.; Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2001) 27-57; David A. DeSilva, *The Hope of Glory*; Idem., *Despising Shame: Honor Discourse and Community Maintenance in the Epistle to the Hebrews* (rev. ed. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 2008) 30-154; Jerome H. Neyrey, *Honor and Shame in the Gospel of Matthew* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1998) 15-34; Joseph H. Hellermann, *Reconstructing Honor in Roman Philippi: Carmen Christi as Cursus Pudorum* (SNTSMS 132; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005) 34-109; Harrison, "Paul and the Roman Ideal of Glory" 201-32; Kei Eun Chang, *The Community, the Individual, and the Common Good: To Idiom and To Sympheron in the Greco-Roman World and Paul* (LNTS; London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2013)

⁴¹ Malina's etic definition (*New Testament World*, 30): "Honor is a claim to worth along with the social acknowledgement of worth." On the diversity of perspectives on what is honorable, see below; Lendon, *Empire of Honour*, 90-95; David DeSilva, *Despising Shame*, 107-55. There are diverse perspectives within individual authors, as in Cicero, whose early definition of glory was (*Inv.* 2.55.166), "widespread reputation accompanied by praise" (*fama cum laude*). In later discussion Cicero expounded a view of glory grounded in *honestum* and *utilitas*: honor is gained through right actions that contribute to the good of society (*Philippics*; *De Officiis*; on which Harrison, "Paul and the Roman Ideal of Glory," 218-19; Chang, *The Community*, 128-34).

⁴² Horace, *Sat.* 1.6.23-24, "Glory (*gloria*) drags along the lowly no less than the highly-born, bound in chains to her resplendent chariot." Tacitus, *Hist.* 4.6; Dio Chrysostom 34.51, "fellow slaves quarrelling with one another over glory and pre-eminence (ἐριζόντων περὶ δόξης καὶ πρωτείων)"; Lucian,

ordered on the basis of reputation.⁴³ Central dynamics of gaining honor were struggle, competition, and being seen and known; as Carlin Barton writes: “one needed to expend one’s energy in a continuous series of ordeals.”⁴⁴ Honor was linked to being visible and seen. Thus, in Greco-Roman sources there arose a conceptual association of one’s honor and virtue with possession of a radiant quality.⁴⁵ Honor, further, was associated with power. On the one hand, honor contributed to the power of the rule over the ruled, and, on the other hand, honor contributed to the power of the ruled over rulers.⁴⁶ Honor was a social force, as was its negative counterpart shame. Like honor, shame functioned to guide people’s behavior. Shame was connected to immortality just as honor was connected to virtue.⁴⁷

More may be said concerning the working of honor within the Greco-Roman world, in particular in its connection to government and the interaction of people of different social status. Honor was a key issue in the political order of the Roman empire, with political offices stratified in terms of honor, with Caesar at the head. Yet, there was nothing distinctly governmental about honoring people. The stratification of government in terms of honor mirrored the ordering of

Peregr. 38: “I was thinking busily, my friend, reflecting what a strange thing love of glory (τὸ φιλόδοξον) is; how this passion alone is unescapable even by those who are considered wholly admirable”; Cicero, *Tusc.* 2.58; John Chrysostom, *Romans*, 244, δόξα is “specially an object of desire among us.”

⁴³ Honor also referred to non-human objects, i.e., cities, temples (Strabo, *Geography* 8.3.30), animals (Apuleius, *Met.* 10.17). See Lendon, *Empire of Honor*, 40.

⁴⁴ Sallust, *Cat.* 7.3-7, “Their hardest struggle for glory was one with another (*gloria maximum certamen*); each man strove to be first to strike down the foe, to scale a wall, to be seen of all while doing such a deed.” Cited in Harrison, “Paul and the Roman Ideal of Glory,” 210. On competition, Neyrey, *Honor and Shame*, 19-20; on honor and activity, Barton, *Roman Honor*, 34-38.

⁴⁵ Sallust, *Jug.* 85.23: The glory of one’s ancestors acts as a kind of light (*maiorum gloria posteris quasi lumen est*); *Cat.* 85.23: “Caesar yearned for a high command, an army and a new war where his virtue could shine forth (*ubi virtus enitescere posset*)”; Cicero, *Fam.* 10.10.2, “Would that there were some commonwealth where honor could shine forth (*in qua honos elucere possit*)”; cited in Barton, *Roman Honor*, 34n.3; Cicero, *Tusc.*, 2.58: “Nature has made us...enthusiastic seekers after honor, and once we have caught, as it were, some glimpse of its radiance, there is nothing we are not prepared to bear and go through in order to secure it.” See 1.2 above.

⁴⁶ Lendon, *Empire of Honour*, 24-25, 52-73.

⁴⁷ Tacitus, *Ann.* 4.38: “to scorn fame is to scorn virtue,” cited in Lendon, *Empire of Honour*, 41.

society in general. People were bound to one another in a network of relations set by the strictures of honor. Thus, a slave's obedience to a master, a wife and husband's respect for one another, a subject's deference to a ruler, or a person's obligations towards the gods, were all conceived in terms of honor earned and due.

Honor was gained through, among other avenues, the relationships of patrons and their clients.⁴⁸ Patrons, in strategic displays of χάρις, provided benefits, including financial aid, legal advocacy, and access to other resources, and in turn clients honored patrons as much as they could; concretely this often entailed extending political support and enhancing the prestige of the patron through publicizing deeds.⁴⁹ Patron-client relationships existed between individuals and other individuals, cities, and even larger units, and they also existed between individuals and gods.⁵⁰ Gods provided for the daily needs of people and in return people honored the gods by participating in religion.⁵¹ Associations named themselves after and in honor of their human and

⁴⁸ Andrew Wallace-Hadrill, ed., *Patronage in Ancient-Society* (London: Routledge, 1990); Stephan Joubert, *Paul as Benefactor: Reciprocity, Strategy, and Theological Reflection in Paul's Collection* (WUNT II/124; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000; James R. Harrison, *Paul's Language of Grace in Its Graeco-Roman Context* (WUNT II/ 172; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003); Zeba Crook, *Reconceptualising Conversion*, 65-89; Jerome E. Neyrey, "God, Benefactor, and Patron," 467-68; Philip A. Harland, *Associations, Synagogues, and Congregations: Claiming a Place in Ancient Mediterranean Society*. 2nd ed. n.p. [cited 5 Apr 2018]. Online: <http://www.philipharland.com/associations>. 50-60; John M. G. Barclay, *Paul and the Gift* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015) 35-39; Morgan, *Roman Faith and Christian Faith*, 60-64. I use the terms "patron" (προστάτης) and "benefactor" (εὐεργέτης) and their cognates interchangeably in this study, following Crook; Neyrey; on which see the discussion in Crook, 59-66 (cf., i.e., *SEG* 43.775, Marcus Messala Corvinus is "patron and benefactor" [πάτρων καὶ εὐεργέτης] of the temple).

⁴⁹ Barclay, *Paul and the Gift*, 35-39. On the vocabulary of gift and gift giving, including χάρις, εὐχαριστία, and ἔλεος, see *Ibid.*, 575-82.

⁵⁰ Crook, *Reconceptualising Conversion*, 67-75.

⁵¹ Philip Harland, *Associations, Synagogues, and Congregations*, 50-60. See account of Isis and Lucius (Apuleius, *Metam.* 11.6): [Isis to Lucius] "I will favour you and you will constantly worship me... by assiduous obedience, worshipful service, and determined celibacy you win the favour of my godhead."

divine patrons.⁵² Seneca viewed human patronage as a continuation and imperfect mirroring of the far-greater generosity of the divine.⁵³

The vocabulary of honor and shame consisted of words such as, in Greek, τιμή, φήμη, ἔπαινος, and others, and, in Latin, *honor*, *fama*, *dignitas*, and *gloria*. Words for shame included the Greek ἀτιμία and αἰσχύνη and Latin *pudor* and *infamia*. Δόξα appeared alongside these words as way of referring to public opinion, reputation, “honor,” “esteem,” “glory.” The philosophical critique of honor culture was itself a feature of the discourse of honor and shame. Common criticisms were that society placed too much emphasis on the opinion of people who do not have understanding and that the pursuit of public esteem was at best vain and at worst a source of bondage.⁵⁴ However, the treatment of honor in philosophers did not amount to straightforward rejection of the category. In the first place, philosophers remained committed, at least on the ground, to the traditional pursuit of notoriety. As Cicero quipped (*Tusc.* 1.15), “Do they not inscribe their names upon the books they write about contempt of fame?”⁵⁵ But, further, in their rhetoric, philosophers did not usually reject the category or language of honor altogether; instead they sought to refocus the pursuit of honor by redefining who or what was honorable. Thus, for Philo (*Crito* 48A), “We must not consider at all what the many will say of us, but he knows about right and wrong, the one man, and truth herself will say.” Likewise, Epictetus calls

⁵² Crook, *Reconceptualising Conversion*, 77-8

⁵³ Seneca, *Ben.* 4.3.3-4.4.4; 4.26.1; cf. Dio Chrysostom, *Dei cogn.* 21, 27-28, 32, 39; cited in *Ibid.*, 76.

⁵⁴ Dio Chrysostom, 66.26, 66.1, 3, 13; Dio criticizes those who “crave distinction and reputation (φιλοτίμους καὶ φιλοδόξους)” and who fight with one another over “crowns and front seats and public proclamations” (66.1-2). Lucretius, 5.1130-35; Philo, *Opif.* 79; cf. *Sobr.* 57; Lucian, *Wis. Nigr.* 4: the philosopher Nigrinus “went on to praise philosophy and the freedom that it gives, and to ridicule the things that are popularly considered blessings—wealth and reputation, dominion, and honor (πλούτου καὶ δόξης καὶ βασιλείας καὶ τιμῆς), yes, and purple and gold—things accounted very desirable by most men, and till then by me also.”

⁵⁵ Tacitus, *Hist.* 4.6, “Even among philosophers the passion for glory (*cupido gloriae*) is the last one rooted out” (my translation).

δόξα a matter of indifference but urges the would-be philosopher to focus on the true path to honor, which in Stoic terms meant concern only for what one can control.⁵⁶

The strategy of redirecting the focus in discussion of honor and shame appears in the early Jewish and Christian material (as in Philo, just noted). A key consideration within these discussions is the opinion of and obedience to God. Thus Ben Sira adopts the trope of the encomium to set apart Israel's heroes, not for the clichéd marks of prestige, but for their obedience to the law and faithfulness to God.⁵⁷ In the gospels Jesus challenges the focus on public opinion: Matthew 6 warns against trumpeting alms in the streets to receive praise from people and thus sacrificing the reward from the Father "who sees in secret," and John 12:43 rebukes the Pharisees because "they loved human glory more than the glory of God (τὴν δόξαν τῶν ἀνθρώπων μᾶλλον ἢ περ τὴν δόξαν τοῦ θεοῦ)."

One trope that developed in early Christian literature was the postponement of honor until the eschaton. This may have been due to several factors, such as the example of Christ, whose resurrection followed shameful crucifixion, and the widespread scorn and violence towards Christians in their early history. Thus, 1 Peter 5:4 refers to the "crown of glory" reserved for those who suffer, who receive this honor when Christ appears.⁵⁸ Likewise, Basil of Caesarea

⁵⁶ *Disc.* 2.9.15; *Ench.* 24.1-2. Cf. Philo, *Fug.* 17, 19, the "true glory (τῆς ἀψευδοῦς εὐδοξίας)" that comes through wisdom. Cicero, *Off.* 2.13.43: the person who desires *veram gloriam* must "discharge the duties required by justice." See Lendon, *Empire of Honour*, 91-92.

⁵⁷ Compare Ben Sira 44:13-14 with Thucydides on the Athenian war dead (2.43.2-4): "They won for themselves the praises that do not grow old, and the most distinguished of all sepulchers...that in which their glory (ἡ δόξα αὐτῶν) survives in everlasting remembrance." Ben Sira scorns those whose (23:18-19) "fear is confined to human eyes," who do not realize that "the eyes of the Lord are ten thousand times brighter than the sun; they look upon all the ways of human beings and see into hidden corners." See also Wis 8:10, 13: because of law-shaped wisdom "I will have glory among the people (δόξαν ἐν ὄχλοις) and honor in the presence of the elders, though I am young...I shall...leave an everlasting remembrance to those who come after me." On Ben Sira and Wisdom, see DeSilva, *Despising Shame*, 107-55.

⁵⁸ See also Wis 5:16, "They will receive...a beautiful diadem (τὸ διάδημα τοῦ κάλλους) from the hand of the Lord." 2 Tim 4:6-8, "There is reserved for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord...will give me on that day...all who longed for his appearing."

depicts the virtuous receiving praise on judgment day on analogy with a public benefactor in a theater: “God will congratulate you, the angels will acclaim you, all of humanity from the beginning of the world will cast blessing on you.”⁵⁹

Like the other Greco-Roman texts, Jewish and Christian sources in many cases present the relationship of God and humans in terms of a reciprocal, patronal relationship. Within these sources God is presented as a benefactor who created and sustains all things who on account of this is due praise from all. Ben Sira refers to the works of the Lord in creation and tells readers, “Be generous when you worship the Lord...Give to the most high as he has given to you...Glorify the Lord, and exalt him as much as you can (δοξάζοντες κύριον ὑψώσατε καθ’ ὅσον ἂν δύνησθε).”⁶⁰ Amid discussion of idolatry Wisdom of Solomon highlights the lesson of the provision of manna in the wilderness, that “it is not the production of crops that feeds humankind, but your word that sustains whose who trust in you.” It is right, therefore, that “one rise before the sun to give you thanks.” Wisdom warns those, like the idolaters of chs. 12-16, who do not render praise for the benefactions of God: “the hope of an ungrateful person will melt like wintry frost.”⁶¹

Josephus and Philo conceptualize the relationship of God and humans in terms of a reciprocal, patron/client, benefaction relationship. As discussed in Crook, Josephus shows the tendency to recast biblical narrative in a way that highlights the patron-client relationship between God and Israel.⁶² Thus, in his retelling of Moses’ speech to the Israelites upon their entrance into Canaan, Moses highlights two benefactions: the freedom of the people and

⁵⁹ PG 31.268, cited in Lendon, *Empire of Honour*, 92.

⁶⁰ 35:10-13, 42:15-43:33, 43:30.

⁶¹ Wis 16:26-29. Israelites suffer (16:11) “so they would not fall into deep forgetfulness and become unresponsive to your benefaction (σῆς εὐεργεσίας).”

⁶² Crook, *Reconceptualising Conversion*, 84-85.

inheriting the promised land. God had already freed the Israelites, but in order to facilitate receiving the second gift, Moses says, “Let us be of one mind and hold God, who is ever our helper and ally, in lasting honour.”⁶³ In *A.J.* 8.111 Josephus states that “it is not possible by what people can do to return sufficient thanks to God for his benefits upon them, for the deity stands in need of nothing...but it is right for us to bless your majesty, and it is necessary for us to return you thanks for what you have bestowed upon our house.”⁶⁴ Likewise, Philo presents God as the patron of the whole world and highlights the granting of human reason as the greatest of all gifts.⁶⁵ Philo holds that God seeks no return for his limitless giving,⁶⁶ yet for Philo humans are still beholden to render God honor. The person who enjoys prosperity and safety “is, of necessity, bound to requite God...who has bestowed untroubled salvation and unalloyed benefits...with hymns, and songs, and prayers, and also with sacrifices...all which things taken together have received the one comprehensive name of praise.”⁶⁷

2.2 Cultic Purity and Divine Presence

The second discourse to discuss here is the discourse of cultic purity and divine presence. Given that the language of glory was a feature of the discourse specifically within the Jewish and

⁶³ *A.J.* 3.300-02; also 4.212, where Moses requires thanksgivings to God twice daily for God’s gifts (δωρεάς). Cited in Crook, *Reconceptualising Conversion*, 84-85.

⁶⁴ My translation. See also *A.J.* 2.60, where choosing a human king is equivalent to rejecting God’s benefaction.

⁶⁵ *Creation* 77; *Alleg. Interp.* 3.77-78

⁶⁶ Philo, *Cher.* 122-23, on human versus divine patronage: “Look round you and you shall find that those who are said to bestow benefits sell rather than give, and those who seem to us to receive them in truth buy. The givers are seeking praise or honour as their exchange and look for the repayment of the benefit, and thus, under the specious name of gift, they in real truth carry out a sale...But God is no salesman...but a free giver of all things, pouring forth eternal fountains of free bounties, and seeking no return. For He has no needs Himself and no created being is able to repay His gift.” In parallel with Seneca, *Ben.* 4.4-9.

⁶⁷ *Spec.* 1.224, cited in Harrison, *Paul’s Language of Grace*, 129n.174.

Christian linguistic contexts, focus is placed upon these sources. Discussion of the presence of God and the human effort to keep gods happy and resident within their temples saturated the ancient world.⁶⁸ Glory came to be associated with this discourse due to its use, in early Jewish and then Christian texts, to mean divine presence, specifically divine presence as manifested in the temple.⁶⁹ Ideas of purity and their connection to the temple have been a topic of much exploration in recent research on Judaism and Christianity.⁷⁰ Here we will consider this specifically in connection to the ideas of divine presence and the language of glory.

The importance of divine presence within the theological reflection of early Judaism and Christianity is firmly established.⁷¹ Within this, Jacob Milgrom is well known, in treatment

⁶⁸ Michael Hundley, *Gods in Dwellings: Temples and Divine Presence in the Ancient Near East* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2013); Linda Marie Günther, "Concepts of Purity in Ancient Greece, with Particular Emphasis on Sacred Sites," in *Purity and the Forming of Religious Traditions in the Ancient Mediterranean World and Ancient Judaism* (eds. Christian Frevel and Christophe Nihan; Leiden: Brill, 2013) 245-60; Bernhard Linke, "Sacral Purity and Social Order in Ancient Rome," in *Purity and the Forming of Religious Traditions in the Ancient Mediterranean World and Ancient Judaism* (eds. Christian Frevel and Christophe Nihan; Leiden: Brill, 2013) 289-309; Baruch E. Levine, "On the Presence of God in Biblical Religion," in *Religions in Antiquity: Essays in Memory of Erwin Ramsdell Goodenough* (ed. Jacob Neusner; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1968) 71-87; Jacob Milgrom, *Studies in Cultic Theology and Terminology* (Leiden: Brill, 1983); Jonathan Klawans, *Impurity and Sin in Ancient Judaism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000); Idem., *Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple: Symbolism and Supersessionism in the Study of Ancient Judaism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006); Moshe Blidstein, *Purity, Community, and Ritual in Early Christian Literature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017).

⁶⁹ Chibici-Revneanu, *Herrlichkeit*, 426: "Deutlich ist die Affinität der כבוד bzw. δόξα zum Bereich des Kultischen; möglicherweise liegen hier sogar die Wurzeln des jüdisch-christlichen Herrlichkeitsverständnisses."

⁷⁰ Milgrom, *Studies in Cultic Theology*; Klawans, *Impurity and Sin*; *Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple*; Hundley, *Gods in Dwellings*; Hannah K. Harrington *The Purity Text* (Companion to the Qumran Scrolls 5; T&T Clark Biblical Studies; London: T&T Clark, 2004); Thomas Kazen, *Jesus and Purity Halakah: Was Jesus Indifferent to Impurity?* (CB 38; Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 2002); Moshe Blidstein, *Purity, Community, and Ritual*. See 11-page bibliography in John P. Meier, "Jesus and Purity Laws," in *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus* (Vol 4. Anchor Yale Bible Reference Library; New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009) 415-26.

⁷¹ Baruch E. Levine, "On the Presence of God in Biblical Religion," 72: "When, however, we attempt to penetrate to the motivations underlying religious activity in ancient Israel...the desire for God's presence in the human community seems to motivate most of the regular aspects of religious life." Jonathan Klawans (*Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple, passim*) argues that early Jewish purity and sacrifice is ordered according to two main principles: *imitatio Dei* and the desire to attract and maintain divine presence. David E. Aune, "Early Christian Eschatology," *ABD* 2.596: "Early Christian worship

specifically of the Levitical priestly material, for highlighting the connection of ideas of purity and sacrifice with the notion of keeping the sacred space pure and suitable as a divine residence. Milgrom defined impurity as an “aerial miasma that possessed magnetic attraction to the realm of the sacred.”⁷² Impurity occasioned God’s wrath and, if not addressed, would lead to God’s departure from among the people. As Milgrom wrote, “Why the urgency to purge the sanctuary? ...The God of Israel will not abide in a polluted sanctuary.” Milgrom highlighted, in connection to this, that God would allow a certain degree of impurity, but would not allow this impurity to accumulate without consequence: “The merciful God will tolerate a modicum of pollution. But there is a point of no return. If the pollution continues to accumulate the end is inexorable...The divine chariot flies heavenward and the sanctuary is left to its doom.”⁷³

Accordingly, within the priestly material there appears a scheme of ritual and purity observances formulated to address impurity and thus keep people, land, and temple pure. As discussed in the analysis of Jonathan Klawans, the priestly material stipulated two types of impurity: ritual impurity and moral impurity.⁷⁴ Ritual impurity was largely unavoidable and was not due to transgression. Sources of ritual impurity included childbirth (Lev 12:1-8), certain skin diseases (Lev 13:1-46, 14:1-32), genital discharges (Lev 15:1-33), and human corpses (Num 19:10-22). Ritual impurity could convey an impermanent contagion to people and items. Ritual impurity was addressed through means of bathing, washing, and specific sacrifices. Moral

functioned primarily as a vehicle for celebrating the realization of salvation in and through Jesus Christ. The goal of salvation, the complete attainment of the presence of God, was considered the object of eschatological hope...The primary way of conceptualizing the complete experience of eschatological salvation was...the conception of the final festal gathering of both angelic beings and redeemed people before the heavenly presence of God.” Stephen C. Barton, *The Spirituality of the Gospels* (London: SPCK, 1992) 1: “Christian spirituality” as expressed especially in the gospels is “*the sense of the divine presence and living in the light of that presence*” (italics original).

⁷² Milgrom, *Studies in Cultic Theology*, 77.

⁷³ Ibid., 81-82.

⁷⁴ See Klawans, *Impurity and Sin*, 21-41; *Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple*, 53-56.

impurity may be distinguished from ritual impurity in several important ways. In the first instance, moral impurity is caused by sins considered so heinous as to be defiling, principally idolatry, murder, and sexual immorality (Leviticus 18; Num 5:11-31; Num 35:33-34; Ps 106:34-41). Further, moral impurity, while it defiles the sinner (Lev 18:24, 19:31), does not convey an impermanent contagion on the person. Moral impurity poses a direct threat to the land (Lev 18:25; Ezek 36:17), while ritual impurity does not. And, moral impurity is addressed not through bathing, washing, or the sacrifices for ritual impurity, but rather through punishment, the atonement rituals of Leviticus 16, or exile. Alongside laws for ritual and moral purity there are the dietary laws (Leviticus 11). As discussed in Klawans, within the priestly material the dietary laws overlap in certain respects with both the ritual and moral impurity systems, but, according to Klawans, the outright prohibition of eating certain foods appears more related to a moral defilement than ritual defilement.⁷⁵

Klawans discusses whether it is appropriate to refer to moral impurity as “metaphorical,” as it has been called in certain past analyses.⁷⁶ In this connection, Klawans poses that what it would mean to call moral impurity metaphorical would be to say that it was not literal or real purity, as ritual impurity was, and/or that it was secondary to ritual impurity and thus metaphorical of it. Klawans writes, with respect to the first issue, that moral impurity is no less literal or real than ritual impurity: both moral impurity and ritual impurity are perceived results of actual physical processes and events and both have perceived consequences and particular means to address them. With respect to the potential secondary nature of moral impurity, Klawans writes, this cannot be demonstrated within the sources. Ritual impurity and moral

⁷⁵ Klawans, *Impurity and Sacrifice*, 32-33.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, 32-36. Milgrom (*Leviticus 1-16: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* [AB 3; New York: Doubleday, 1992] 37) labelled moral impurity metaphorical.

impurity appear alongside one another in the priestly material, and the other sources that attest to ritual and/or moral impurity cannot be dated to a degree of confidence that would suggest that either moral impurity or ritual impurity were primary to the other. Thus, Klawans demonstrates that it is not appropriate to call moral impurity “metaphorical” as opposed to literal or real. In the priestly material and elsewhere the two stand alongside one another as categories of real, perceived impurity attached to specific actions and events.

Indicative of the conceptual framework of purity, sacrifice, and divine presence discussed here are the depictions of God’s presence among the people as presented in the narrative and legal materials of Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers. Exodus stipulates the presence of God in the tabernacle and Exodus 29 refers to the daily burnt offering which is oriented towards keeping God among the people: “It shall be a regular burnt offering throughout your generations at the entrance of the tent of meeting before the Lord, where I will meet with you there. I will meet with the Israelites there, and it shall be sanctified by my glory” (see also Exod 33:12-16). In similar manner, Leviticus and Numbers ground their call for purity upon the concern for divine presence, as in Num 35:30-34, “You shall not pollute the land in which you live...in which I also dwell,” discussing murder and its punishment, and Lev 15:31, “You shall keep the people of Israel separate from their uncleanness, so that they do not die in their uncleanness by defiling my tabernacle that is in their midst.”

The influence of the cultic framework of the Levitical priestly material is reflected in other parts of the Hebrew Bible and later Jewish theological reflection. Jeremiah and Ezekiel refer to the sins of idolatry, bloodshed, and sexual immorality as morally defiling (Jer 2:23, 3:1; Ezek 11:6-7, 22:1-4, 36:18). Sins morally defile the people and the land and pollute the sanctuary, threatening the continued presence of God among the people and, at least in Ezekiel,

leading the divine presence to depart and to exile.⁷⁷ Jeremiah and Ezekiel, as well as other prophetic texts, critique sacrifice, but this does not amount to a rejection of sacrifice; rather in these sources there is critique of the current situation connected to the priests, in which there might have been an issue of performing sacrifices through theft.⁷⁸ Ezra and Nehemiah represent a development on the Levitical code inasmuch as they present Gentiles as inherently morally impure and connect moral impurity with the prohibition of intermarriage (Deut 7:1-4; Ezra 9:1-3, 10-12; Neh 13:26, 30; cf. Leviticus 18).⁷⁹ Jubilees also prohibits intermarriage in view of the moral impurity of gentiles (30:7-15; gentiles practicing idolatry, 22:16-22, performing sexual sins, 20:3-7) and even commands to refrain from eating with gentiles (22:16).⁸⁰

A brief listing of certain important terms within the biblical discussion of cultic purity and divine presence may be offered.⁸¹ There were of course terms for pure and impure, טהור/καθαρός and טמא/ἀκάθαρτος. These terms might be used for both ritual and moral purity/impurity.⁸² This applies also to the verbs of defilement and cognate terms for purity and impurity such as טהר/καθαρίζω, to purify, and the term impurity, טמא/ἀκαθαρσία. In addition to the terms for purity and impurity, there is the related term holy, שׁקד/ἅγιος. The language of

⁷⁷ See temple sermon in Jeremiah 7 and 26 (Upon surveying Israel's sins, "Do not trust in these deceptive words: this is the temple of the Lord").

⁷⁸ See Klawans, *Impurity and Sin*, 26-31; *Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple*, 89-100.

⁷⁹ Klawans, *Impurity and Sin*, 44-45.

⁸⁰ Further on gentile impurity see Mira Balberg, *Purity, Body, and Self in Early Rabbinic Literature* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2014) 125-31; p. 130, "The Gentiles' abominable deeds came to be seen as a manifestation of their unchanging unholiness, and thereby the impurity associated with these deeds came to be seen as intrinsic and fixed."

⁸¹ The language of purity and impurity could occur outside of cultic contexts: for instance, purity language could describe water and other substances free from admixture (*Hdt.* 4.53; Ps 12:6, "The words of God are pure words [λόγια ἁγνά] / silver refined in a furnace on the ground / purified seven times [κεκαθαρισμένον ἑπταπλασίως]), birth, "citizens of pure blood," (*Thuc.* 5.8) and so on, where there is no connection to cult. Cultic purity language is signaled by its coordination with other cultic language and ideas (temple, sacrifice, priesthood, holiness); on which see further Nijay K. Gupta, *Worship that Makes Sense to Paul: A New Approach to the Theology and Ethics of Paul's Cultic Metaphors* (BZNW 175; Berlin: De Gruyter, 2010) 36-46.

⁸² Klawans, *Impurity and Sin*, 22.

holiness could be used in relation to God, “I am holy,” and in connection to Israel (Lev 10:44-45, 22:32). It was used in relation to the priests and vessels of the temple; they must be made holy and thus fit to be in God’s presence and used for cultic service (Exod 28:3, 41; Lev 20:26, 21:6, 8; Num 6:5, 8; 15:40, 19:20). Holiness was applied to sacrifices and to the sanctuary itself (Lev 16:20, Leviticus 22). Holiness often occurred in binary with profaneness, to be common, *לִבְבִי/בִּבְבִּי* (Lev 10:10, 21:7; Ezek 22:26, 44:23; “You shall not profane my holy name” [καὶ οὐ βεβηλώσετε τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ ἁγίου]).

There were, in addition to these terms, the language of sacrifice and the tabernacle and temple, including, relatedly, the language of God’s presence. Within biblical and later Jewish literature certain terms were used in connection to specific sacrifices: i.e., *עֹלָה*/ὄλοκαύτωμα, burnt offering (Exod 29:42; Num 28:27), the “peace offering,” *זֶבַח שְׁלָמִים*/θυσία σωτηρίου, and the purification offering, *זֶבַח טָהוֹר*/περὶ τῆς ἁμαρτίας (Lev 4:1-5:13, Num 15:22-31).⁸³ Words for the tabernacle and temple included *מִקְדָּשׁ*, *מִזְבֵּחַ*, *אֹתֶן*, and *יְהוֹנָדָה*, as well as the objects and vessels that appeared there. The texts employed terms for divine presence such as *שְׁכִינָה*/ὄνομα, *רוּחַ קֹדֶשׁ*/πνεῦμα, and the language of glory, *כְּבוֹד*/δόξα.

In addition to the above listed vocabulary one may also mention terms for sin that appear in connection to defilement. A term regularly used in connection to defiling sin is “abomination,” *תּוֹעֵבָה*/βδέλυγμα (i.e., Lev 18:27, 29, 5:2). There are in addition other terms for transgression that could be employed in connection with impurity: in Greek, ἁμαρτία, ἀδικία, ἀσέβεια, and παράβασις. The language of wrath (*אַף*, ὀργή/θυμός) may also be added here, insofar as impurity caused by sin raised God’s wrath and, if not addressed, had severe consequences.

⁸³ See Gary A. Anderson, “Sacrifice and Sacrificial Offerings (OT),” *ABD* 5.873-81.

The interest in purity, clear from the biblical sources, persisted into and appears to have grown within the second Temple period. Hannah Harrington wrote, “Issues of cult and purity engaged and divided Jews more in this period than at any other time in antiquity.” In discussion of the conventions of purity reflected in the Dead Sea Scrolls, Harrington holds, “Purity was not limited to a handful of extremists who lived in the desert, but was rooted at the heart of Jewish life.”⁸⁴ This period is marked as one of disagreement and debate concerning purity issues. This is reflected in, among other sources, the texts from Qumran and the Gospel accounts.

Harrington offers an extensive analysis of the ideas related to purity of the sectarian Dead Sea community. The findings indicate how a group may employ the language and ideas of purity and affirm and/or reconfigure them in line with their own identity and ends. Harrington summarizes the characteristics of the Dead Sea Scrolls’ account of purity (which, she holds, is broadly unified across the texts)⁸⁵ in terms of several summary statements: that among the scrolls there is tendency to expand the categories of holiness and purity of the Torah and read purity restrictions maximally; that impurity is defined as a more malevolent force than in any other ancient Jewish text in terms of source, contagion, and purification; that pure food and drink become a central focus of the community; and that ritual and moral impurity are intertwined. In these ways, the Qumran community differs with the perspectives represented in the priestly material and also in many cases, particularly in its stipulations for holiness, diverges with the Rabbinic discussions of purity.

⁸⁴ Harrington, *The Purity Texts*, 7.

⁸⁵ But see criticism of this in Klawans, *Impurity and Sin*, 67-91. This criticism concerns whether ritual and moral impurity were distinguished within the Dead Sea Scrolls. Klawans sees diachronic development according to which the clearly sectarian and later texts conflate ritual and moral impurity, while the *Temple Scroll*, composed earlier, maintains the distinction. To this one may respond that systemic similarities exist across the texts, even if in this respect certain texts differ.

It is important to observe, in this connection, the interest in divine presence undergirding the call for purity in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Repeatedly the texts appeal to the presence of God among the people as the reason the people must keep themselves pure. This is of course connected to the sentiment that the community itself represented a substitute for the Temple in Jerusalem, at least during the period of exile in the desert: as 4Q174 I, 6 states, “He has commanded that a Sanctuary of men be built for Himself, that there they may send up, like the smoke of incense, the works of the Law” (cf. 1QS VIII, 5-9; IX, 3-6).⁸⁶ The *Temple Scroll* aligns with the maximalist interpretation of purity regulations characteristic of the community, and the text repeatedly appeals to the presence of God within the temple as the reason for maintaining its strict purity requirements (11QT LXV, 12-14; LXVI, 4-8, 11-12; LI, 7-10). As Harrington writes, “The fundamental principle underlying the purity laws of the Temple Scroll is that the sanctity of the Temple, resulting from God’s presence in it, is so strong that it radiates outward to the entire city, requiring all persons who live or enter there to meet a high standard of purity.”⁸⁷

The Dead Sea Scrolls raise the question of the relationship of ritual impurity to moral impurity. The distinction between the two are more or less distinct in the Hebrew Bible, and upheld firmly in the Rabbinic sources, but the line between them is blurred within certain texts of the Dead Sea Scrolls.⁸⁸ Thus, moral failings must be handled through ritual purifications, and persons who are ritually impure, such as the leper and the *zav*, are deemed sinners and under the

⁸⁶ On the replacement of the Jerusalem Temple in Qumran, Klawans, *Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple*, 163, states, “Most likely, the sectarians saw their temple-free existence as a *provisional* response to an undesired circumstance.”

⁸⁷ Harrington, *Purity Texts*, 51. Klawans, *Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple*, 155, “The *Temple Scroll* emphasizes again and again that its concerns with ritual purity are related to the fact that God’s name, presence, or glory is to dwell in the sanctuary.”

⁸⁸ See, on the Temple Scroll, which maintains the dichotomy, Klawans, *Impurity and Sin*, 67-91.

influence of impure spirits who lead them to lustful thoughts.⁸⁹ All who are dealing with impurity, no matter the type, can be viewed as going through moral renewal.⁹⁰

We see from the Dead Sea Scrolls how certain early Jews, influenced by the framework of the priestly material, configured the ideas of purity and impurity according to their own theological frameworks and communal identity. Further perspective is offered within the Gospel accounts. One may draw attention, in this connection, to the baptism of John (Mark 1:2-11; Matthew 3:1-17; Luke 3:1-22; John 1:19-34). Here we find a water purification ritual of the kind that appears in Leviticus 15:11, 13-14 and in Qumran texts (1QS III, 6-9; 4Q274 1-4) in connection to ritual impurity. John's baptism, on the other hand, is not connected to ritual impurity; the rite was for forgiveness of sins and had an eschatological orientation (Mark 1:4; Matt 3:2, 11-12).⁹¹ Further, whereas water purification was to be undertaken regularly in the Qumran texts, John's baptism was, it appears, only to be undertaken once.

The forgiveness of sin element of the baptism connects John's baptism with rituals associated not with ritual purification but with cleansing of sin as in Leviticus 16. Klawans calls John's baptism a "ritual of moral purification, with eschatological overtones."⁹² In presenting baptism as a means of cleansing moral defilement, the Gospel tradition aligns John's baptism with the emphasis on moral impurity appearing in connection to Jesus in Mark 7 and Matthew 15. These narratives concern the hands washing ritual of the Pharisees (Mark 7:3-5), to which Jesus responds that (7:18, 20) "whatever goes into a person from the outside cannot defile...it is what comes out of a person that defiles." The texts (Mark 7:21-23; Matt 15:19-20) then list sins

⁸⁹ 4Q272 I, 1-16; Harrington, *The Purity Texts*, 27-30. See Zech 13:2 for reference to unclean spirit; also the Gospels' reference to πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον (Mark 1:23, 26; Matt 10:1, 12:43, 4:33); discussion in Blidstein, *Purity, Community, and Ritual*, 234-35.

⁹⁰ Harrington, *The Purity Texts*, 29.

⁹¹ Klawans, *Impurity and Sin*, 138-43.

⁹² *Ibid.*, 139.

that were thought to be morally defiling: “fornication, theft, murder, adultery, avarice, wickedness...All these things come from within, and they defile a person (πάντα ταῦτα τὰ πονηρὰ ἔσωθεν ἐκπορεύεται καὶ κοινοῖ τὸν ἄνθρωπον).”⁹³ Jesus emphasizes moral purity over ritual impurity, which accords with the presentation of John’s baptism in connection to moral defilement.⁹⁴

The presentation of John’s baptism, and the focus of Mark and Matthew on moral defilement, are consistent with configurations of purity within the early Christian sources. Ritual and dietary regulations were regularly curtailed and/or deemphasized (Mark 7:19; Acts 10:9-16; 15:20, 29, 21:25; Rom 14:14); emphasis was placed on moral defilement and purification from and forgiveness of sins.⁹⁵ There was an emphasis on the moral purity necessary for being in divine presence: Matt 5:8, “Blessed are the pure in heart, for they will see God”; James 4:7-8, “Draw near to God, and he will draw near to you. Cleanse your hands, sinners, and purify your hearts, double-minded; Rev 21:11, 23, 27, new Jerusalem “has the glory of God...people will bring to it the glory and honor of the nations, but nothing unclean will enter it.”⁹⁶ Accordingly, an image that appears frequently is the image of the community and individual as temple of God, which must be kept pure. This appears in Paul’s letters, of course, and also in discussion of moral purity in subsequent Christian theologizing: for instance, Tatian, *Orat* 15-16, “Such is the nature

⁹³ For parallel lists see Klawans, *Impurity and Sin*, 148-49.

⁹⁴ Ibid., 146-50; cf. Kazen, *Jesus and Purity* Halakah, 200-262.

⁹⁵ Klawans, *Impurity and Sin*, 138-57; Blidstein, *Purity, Community, and Ritual*, 233: “In Christianity defilement as an aspect of sin was dominant, while in Judaism we find various types of defilement, some linked to sin and some not.”

⁹⁶ Jude 24, “Now to him who is able to keep you from falling, and to make you stand without blemish (ἀμώμους) in the presence of his glory (κατενώπιον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ) with rejoicing...”; Heb 2:10-11; Col 1:22; Eph 1:4, 5:5, 27; 1 John 3:2-3, 6, “When he is revealed, we will be like him, for we will see him as he is. And all who have this hope in him purify themselves, just as he is pure.”

of man's constitution; and, if it be like a temple, God is pleased to dwell in it by the spirit"; 2 *Clement* 8.6-9.3, "Keep the flesh pure...guard the temple of God."⁹⁷

Further, in connection to purity and divine presence in early Christianity, there developed a regular motif of Jesus as a Levitical sacrifice that makes enjoyment of divine presence possible: Heb 9:21-28, 10:19-22, "since we have confidence to enter the sanctuary by the blood of Jesus, by the new and living way he opened for us"; 1 Pet 3:18, "Christ suffered once for all to bring you to God"; Eph 2:13-18, "But now you who were once far off were brought near by the blood of Christ...through him both of us have access in one spirit to the Father" (cf. Eph 3:12); Tit 2:13-14, "We wait for the blessed hope and manifestation of the glory of our great God and Savior Jesus Christ...who gave himself for us that he might redeem us from iniquity and purify for himself a people of his own."⁹⁸ In these cases, Jesus' death and blood are sacrificial in the sense that they have a purgative function and are connected to divine presence. The blood of Jesus cleanses the people, just as the Levitical purification offering (Lev 4:1-5:13; Leviticus 16) cleansed the temple, the people, and the land.⁹⁹ This sacrifice makes possible enjoyment of and access to divine presence, just as the purifying sacrificial rituals purged impurity so that God might remain with the people.¹⁰⁰ The Jesus as sacrifice motif bears the mark of a ritual purification rite, insofar as it appears to be necessary rite for access into the place where God is.

⁹⁷ On which further Blidstein, *Purity, Community, and Ritual*, 158-75.

⁹⁸ Also Tit 2:13-14, "We wait for the blessed hope and manifestation of the glory our great God and Savior Jesus Christ...who gave himself for us that he might redeem us from iniquity and purify for himself a people of his own."

⁹⁹ On the cleansing of people by the purification offering, see Joshua M. Vis, "The Purgation of Persons through the Purification Offering," in *Sacrifice, Cult, and Atonement in Early Judaism and Christianity: Constituents and Critique* (eds. Henrietta L. Wiley and Christian A. Eberhart; Atlanta: SBL, 2017) 33-57; anticipated in Gary A. Anderson, "Sacrifice and Sacrificial Offerings (OT)," *ABD* 5.880.

¹⁰⁰ Klawans, *Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple*, on attracting and maintaining divine presence.

In this case, as in the baptism of John,¹⁰¹ we detect the influence of the priestly material while noticing the willingness of users of the language to reconfigure the norms of purity according to their social and theological frameworks.

More could of course be said about the discourse of cultic purity and divine presence in early Judaism and Christianity. It is enough further to note here the texts that refer to the loss of divine presence. As noted at the beginning of the survey, the potential for the loss of divine presence was built into the structure of the priestly system of purity and sacrifice. Accordingly, certain texts indicate the view that, due to impurity caused by sin and the wrath of God, God moved away from the people. An early such instance is 1 Sam 4:1-7:1, the narrative of the loss of the ark from Shiloh. The narrative may predate the priestly material, but, even if this is the case, it, like the priestly material, indicates the conceptual connection of sin and divine absence. The Philistines battle the Israelites and capture the ark of God, which represents God's presence. The narrative interprets what occurs in terms of sin leading to loss of divine presence (1 Kgdms 4:22): "The glory of Israel has been removed (ἀπόκισται δόξα Ἰσραηλ)," due to the sins of Eli and his sons.

Jeremiah, in the temple sermon of chapters 7 and 26, picks up and redeploys the sin and loss of divine presence motif of the Shiloh narrative. Jeremiah 7:3 states, according to at least one redactional layer, "Amend your ways and your doings, and let me dwell with you in this place," referring to the temple. The reason for the potential for divine absence is expressed in Jer

¹⁰¹ The baptism of John, as already discussed, takes what was at first a rite of ritual purification and makes it a means of addressing moral defilement. The Jesus as sacrifice motif takes, apparently, a motif that was originally connected to moral defilement, the purification offering (Yom Kippur rituals *in toto?*), and makes it not only a means of cleansing moral defilement but also a means of entrance into the temple—this latter aspect being a function of ritual purification. The logic unifying the Jesus as sacrifice motif is clear enough: people are morally impure; one must be pure to be in God's presence; Jesus' death, specifically his blood, cleanses people of moral impurity so that they may be in God's presence.

7:8-15; Jeremiah lists the defiling sins of Israel, stealing, murder, adultery, and making offerings to Baal, on account of which God says to the people, “I will do to the house that is called by my name...just what I did to Shiloh.” Jeremiah reports, in accordance with the priestly view, that, due to impurity, God will depart the temple in Jerusalem and the people will experience exile (cf. 26:3-6, 9).

The same perspective appears in Ezekiel. Ezekiel presents the morally defiling sins of the people, the “great lawlessness” of Israel, comprising principally idolatry and bloodshed. God questions Ezekiel (8:6), “Mortal, do you see the great abominations that the house of Israel are committing here, to drive me far from my sanctuary?” God states, “I will act in my wrath,” which is expressed in terms of departure of divine presence and exile. Ezekiel watches as the glory of the Lord leaves Jerusalem through the east gate (10:4, 18-22, 11:22-23).

The convention of divine departure on account of impurity appears, as well, in Josephus, who interprets the factors behind the fall of Jerusalem to Rome. The destruction of the Temple was due, in Josephus view, to the movement of God away due to the defilement caused by sin. Because of the impurity of Israel God had moved away from the people and taken the side of the Romans:

[They] were guilty, I imagine, of no such rank impiety as yours (οὐδὲν οἶμαι τῶν τότε ἡσεβηκότων τηλικούτον ἤλικά ὑμεῖς). My belief, therefore, is that the deity has fled from the holy places and taken his stand on the side of those with whom you are now at war. (*J.W.* 5.411-12)

This account appears in *Jewish War* and also in *Antiquities of the Jews*:

Even God himself, for loathing of their impiety (μισήσαντα τὴν ἀσέβειαν αὐτῶν), turned away from our city and, because he deemed the temple to be no longer a clean dwelling

place for him (τὸ δὲ ἱερόν οὐκέτι καθαρὸν οἰκητήριον αὐτῷ), brought the Romans upon us and purification by fire upon the city (τῇ πόλει καθάρσιον πῦρ). (*A.J.* 20.164-66).¹⁰²

Tacitus offers a parallel account of the departure of the divine from the Jerusalem Temple (*Hist.* 5.13): “Of a sudden the doors of the shrine opened and a superhuman voice cried: ‘The gods are departing.’” Tacitus would not have been unfamiliar with the convention of a god’s movement away from sacred precincts, as discussed below. Further reference to the loss of divine presence in connection to impurity, specifically moral impurity, appears throughout rabbinic literature, and only a few examples of this need to be mentioned.¹⁰³ A tannaitic commentary on Lev 20:1-3, (“Any of the people of Israel...who give any of their offspring to Molech shall be put to death...defiling my sanctuary and profaning my name”) states, “This teaches that [Molech worship] defiles the sanctuary, profanes the Name, causes the Divine Presence to depart, brings the sword upon Israel, and exiles them from the Land.”¹⁰⁴ Certain texts report that deceit and arrogance are defiling sins that led to divine absence.¹⁰⁵ Not from the Rabbinic corpus, but nonetheless related, is the pseudepigraphal *Testament of Solomon*, which reports of the loss of divine presence from the person both in terms of spirit and of glory (26:6-7): “So the spirit of God (πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ) departed from me and from that day on my words became as idle talk. She convinced me to build temples of idols. I, wretched man that I am, carried out her advice and the glory of God (δόξα τοῦ θεοῦ) completely departed from me.”

We see from the above discussion, then, facets of the Jewish and Christian discussion of purity, and in particular the robust association of divine presence with the conventions of purity.

¹⁰² Cf. *J.W.* 2.539, 5.19, 6.124-28, 6.299-300.

¹⁰³ On which, further, see principally Klawans, “*Siluk Ha-Shekinah*: Sin, Defilement, and the Departure of the Divine Presence,” in *Impurity and Sin*, 118-35.

¹⁰⁴ *Sifra Kedoshim*, Parashah 10:8, cited in Klawans, *Impurity and Sin*, 120.

¹⁰⁵ *Sifra Kedoshim*, Perek 4:1; *Sifre Deut.* on Deut 25:16.

We highlighted the structural interest in divine presence connected to questions of purity, sacrifice, and temple, and we noted certain ways in which early Jews and then Christians employed and at times reconfigured the ideas related to these issues. We observed, also, the use of the language of glory, particularly glory as divine presence, within the discourse.

Another area of interest to remark on here briefly is the discourse of cultic purity and divine presence represented outside of the Jewish and Christian contexts. To offer this topic any measure of the attention it deserves would go beyond the scope of the study. It must suffice simply to note here certain conceptual parallels. In the first instance, there was, within ancient conceptions of cult generally, a common connection of cult and divine presence. Temples housed the gods, and purification rituals and regulations ensured that sacred spaces remained fit residences for the divine. This is evident in ancient Egyptian, Mesopotamian, and Hittite religious conceptions;¹⁰⁶ it is also clear from the Greek sources, which attest, as Robert Parker remarks, to a “science of division,” where boundaries marked “the sanctuaries and precincts of the gods, so that nobody may cross them unless he be pure.”¹⁰⁷ Diodorus Siculus attests to the Greek convention that “those performing sacrifice should approach the gods wearing not expensive clothes...similarly they should present themselves with a body clean (καθαρόν) of every deed of injustice (ἀδίκου πράξεως), but also with a ritually pure soul.”¹⁰⁸ In Roman religious observances, according to Bernhard Linke, there was high degree of confidence in the

¹⁰⁶ On which see Hundley, *Gods in Dwellings*; “Divine Presence in Ancient Near Eastern Temples,” *Religion Compass* 9 (2015): 203-15, pp. 204-05, “Purification rituals designed to keep pollutants from infecting the divine realm often featured as part of larger rituals like the daily cult ritual or the Mesopotamian *akītu* ceremony...Rather than simply assuming divine presence, people sought to make divine abodes as alluring as possible, for if they gods were dissatisfied, they could always move out.”

¹⁰⁷ Robert Parker, *Miasma: Pollution and Purification in Early Greek Religion* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1996) 18-19.

¹⁰⁸ 10.9.6. Translation from Andrej Petrovic and Ivana Petrovic, *Inner Purity and Pollution in Greek Religion: Volume I: Early Greek Religion* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016) 55.

abiding presence of the gods. However, as Linke notes, “If justified doubts concerning the permanent sacral presence occurred, the society disintegrated into its most basic elements to restore its exclusive relation to the gods in the context of the *lectisternia* and the *supplicationes*.”¹⁰⁹

This leads to the second and final conceptual parallel to note here, namely that within antiquity in general, as in the Jewish and Christian sources, there was a recognition of the potential for divine absence from temples. This appears in connection to other near Eastern traditions that refer to the divine abandonment of temples on account of human sin.¹¹⁰ Virgil, in like manner, reported in the *Aeneid* (2.351), “All the gods on whom this empire was stayed have gone forth, leaving shrine and altar; the city you aid is in flames.”¹¹¹ The Roman military practice of *evocatio* attests to the importance of resident deities and the concept of the movable god.¹¹² Livy records the use of the practice during the invasion of Veii, at which time the Romans invited Juno to move away from the temple of the city in order to receive better cult, a grand temple, in Rome. In response, Juno (5.22.3-7) “was moved from her place with contrivances of little power, and as though she accompanied them voluntarily, and was lightly and easily transferred...to the Aventine.” According to Pliny and Plutarch it was due to the possibility of *evocatio* that Romans kept the name of their resident deity secret.¹¹³ Thus, we see certain broader conceptual parallels (divine presence linked to purity and temple; the possibility

¹⁰⁹ Linke, “Sacral Purity,” 305.

¹¹⁰ Babylonian inscription: “The gods and goddesses who dwelt in it fled like birds and went up to heaven. The protective gods...[ran] off and withdrew...their gods abandoned them, rendering them helpless.” OIP 2, 64:22-24; translation in Morton Cogan, *Imperialism and Religion: Assyria, Judah, and Israel in the Eight and Seventh Centuries B. C. E.* (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1974) 20.

¹¹¹ See also Horace 1.2.25-26, “What god shall Rome invoke to stay her fall?” implying that the gods are not there.

¹¹² See Gustaffson, *Evocatio Deorum*.

¹¹³ Pliny, *Nat.* 28.18-19; Plutarch 278F; discussion in Gustaffson, *Evocatio Deorum*, 129-40.

of divine absence), though of course the Jewish and Christian contexts, like the various kinds of “pagan” contexts, show their own distinct conventions and sets of traditions.

2.3 Eschatological Expectation

A third discourse in which the language of glory played a role was the discourse of eschatological expectation. The language of glory played a noticeable though relatively circumscribed role in the eschatological speculation of non-Jewish and non-Christian sources. We highlight here in brief certain instances of the language of glory in eschatological contexts in the broader contexts and then consider the Jewish and Christian texts. The discourse of eschatological expectation, as discussed here, consisted of ancient ideas and language dealing with a new state of affairs at “the end.” As Hubert Cancik noted, “the end” did not in most cases signal the absolute end of history. Rather, the end may be defined as boundary, and, usually, when the boundary is crossed, “something is left over, out of which a new beginning arises.”¹¹⁴ Eschatological speculation in antiquity was more or less mythical, more or less scientific, more or less philosophical, or more or less religious. Eschatological thinking concerned individual eschatology (the question of life after death; the nature of the afterlife); the fate of groups, nations, and cities; and the cosmological dynamics that stood above and oftentimes guided history. Eschatology in antiquity was in many cases tied to cosmogony. This appears in Virgil, who imagined a return to the golden age of Hesiod; it appeared as well in the Stoic conflagration motif, which was premised on the idea of a constant renewal of history through divine fire.

¹¹⁴ Cancik, “The End of the World, of History, and of the Individual in Greek and Roman Antiquity,” in *The Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism. Volume I: The Origins of Apocalypticism in Judaism and Christianity* (ed. John J. Collins; London: Continuum, 2000) 88.

Insofar as glory was associated with honor and fame, it was associated in Greco-Roman eschatology with the idea of the immortality of heroes: heroes achieved great renown through their exploits during life and, as a result, achieve immortality and even a kind of divinity.¹¹⁵ Glory as light, radiance, as it was used in Jewish and Christian contexts, was related to the light of utopias: thus, Pindar (*Ol.* 2.61-62), “forever having sunshine in equal nights and equal days, good men receive a life of less toil...in company with the honored gods, those who joyfully kept their oaths spend a tearless existence,” and Lucian (*Ver. hist.* 2.12), “The light which is on the country is like the gray morning toward dawn...moreover, they are acquainted with only one season...for it is always spring there.”¹¹⁶ Further, the term “age of glory” (*aeternum decus* and *aevum decus*) appears in Ovid and Virgil. Ovid refers to the eternal glory of the house of Caesar (*Tristia* 3.45-46). Virgil, in the *Fourth Eclogue*, refers to an “age of glory” brought on by a child’s birth (4.11), which is a return to the golden age of Hesiod, the epoch of prosperity and security (4.4-11). The birth of the child is associated with the rule of the Caesars, who, in Virgil’s account, granted the Romans “dominion without end” (*Aen.* 1.278).¹¹⁷

Here we see then certain conceptual associations of glory in connection to eschatology in the broader Greco-Roman context, insofar as the language of glory was used in connection to honor and splendor. The language of glory had a distinct profile in the parlance of Jewish and Christian eschatology, which is surveyed in the remainder of the discussion. First to note in this respect is the prominence of the language of glory within the eschatological discussion represented in these sources. The language appears regularly in biblical and later Jewish and then

¹¹⁵ Gregory Nagy, *The Best of the Achaeans: Concepts of the Hero in Ancient Greek Poetry* (Baltimore and London: John Hopkins, 1979) 170-210; Christopher Bryan, *The Resurrection of the Messiah* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011) 19-33.

¹¹⁶ On which Eric J. Gilchrest, *Revelation 21-22 in Light of Jewish and Greco-Roman Utopianism* (Biblical Interpretation Series 118; Leiden: Brill, 2013) 56-57.

¹¹⁷ See Cancik, “The End of the World,” 117-19.

Christian discussions of eschatology, whereas the specific language of δόξα does not have any particularly strong association with eschatology outside of these contexts. In this respect we detect the influence of the use of the language of glory in the Greek Jewish scriptures.¹¹⁸ To note first in this relation is the biblical prophetic eschatology, represented in Ezekiel and especially Isaiah. Ezekiel and Isaiah associate the eschatological experience of glory with the restoration of Jerusalem. In Ezekiel 43:1 the text envisions the glory of God (δόξα θεοῦ Ἰσραηλ) returning to Jerusalem from the way it had departed. God promises, “I will reside among them forever.” Ezekiel ends on the note of the promise of continued presence (48:35), “The name of that city from that time on shall be, The Lord is there.”

Isaiah shows peculiar interest in glory. This is the case already with the Hebrew version of the text; within this, the motif of God’s כבוד is important; yet this is even more the case with the Greek version. As discussed in L. H. Brockington, δόξα was one of the favorite words of the Greek translator of Isaiah and “had considerable significance for him.”¹¹⁹ The term כבוד is used 28 times in the Hebrew text, while the term δόξα is used 68 times in the Greek.¹²⁰ Like Ezekiel, Isaiah anticipates the end-time coming of the glory of God (as the presence of God) for the restoration of Jerusalem (Isaiah 60): the text reports, concerning Jerusalem (60:1-2), “Arise, shine, your light has come, for the glory of the Lord has risen upon you...his glory will appear over you.” There will be no need for sun or the moon, since (60:19) “the Lord will be your everlasting light, and your God will be your glory” (see also 24:23, 66:18). Isaiah, particularly the Greek version of Isaiah, regularly connects glory with “salvation” (σωτηρία or σωτήριον).

¹¹⁸ On which see, in addition to this discussion, Chibici-Revneanu, *Herrlichkeit*, 450-64. On the influence of the use of glory in the LXX on later Jewish and Christian texts, see Newman, *Paul’s Glory-Christology*; Frey, “The Use of δόξα.”

¹¹⁹ Brockington, “The Greek Translator of Isaiah and His Interest in ΔΟΞΑ,” *VT* 1 (1951): 26.

¹²⁰ Frey, “The Use of δόξα,” 91.

Thus, the translator of Isa 12:2 changes “for the Lord God is my strength and song, and he has become my salvation” to “the Lord is my glory and my song, and he has become my salvation.” Likewise, in Isa 40:5, the Hebrew text states, “The glory of the Lord shall be revealed, and all people shall see it together,” whereas the Greek text reads, “The glory of the Lord shall appear, and all flesh will see the salvation of God.”¹²¹ Moreover, the Greek text of Isaiah envisions an end time experience of glory for Israel, which accompanies the restoration of Zion (4:2-6). God will “in that day shine in council with glory upon the earth, and he will exalt and glorify the remnant of Israel.” At the restoration of Zion there will be purification of Israel and Jerusalem (4:4), and God’s presence will be there in the cloud by day and fire by night (4:5; cf. Exod 13:21-22).

In line with the portrait of Ezekiel and Isaiah, other early Jewish texts refer to the coming of the glory of God in connection to the restoration of Jerusalem (Zech 2:14-15; Joel 4:17; Baruch 5; 4:24; Tob 13:16; 2 Bar. 32:4; *Ps. Sol.* 17:30; 11QT XXIX, 7-10; cf. Hag 2:7, 9; Rev 21:11, 23, 24, 26).¹²² Thus, Baruch 5 refers to the gathering of the dispersed people and renewal of Jerusalem in terms of glory, “Take off the garment of your sorrow and affliction, O Jerusalem, and put on forever the beauty of the glory of God...For God will show you splendor everywhere under heaven...so that Israel may walk safely in the glory of God” (cf. 4:24). *Psalms of Solomon* 17 connects glory, at the restoration of Jerusalem, with both God and the Messiah. In 17:31, the nations come to Jerusalem to see the glory of the Messiah (“to see his glory”) and to see the glory of the Lord, “with which he has glorified [Jerusalem].”¹²³

¹²¹ Brockington, “The Greek Translator,” 30; Frey, “The Use of δόξα,” 92. For more salvation and glory in Isaiah, see 60:1-7; 63:12-14.

¹²² See Chibici-Revneanu, *Herrlichkeit*, 450.

¹²³ Compare with *Ps. Sol.* 2:19, 21, “For the gentiles insulted Jerusalem, trampling her down...She took off the wreath of glory which God had put on her; in dishonor her beauty was thrown to the ground.”

There is within early Jewish apocalyptic texts an expectation of future glory for the righteous as an eschatological reward (2 *Bar* 51:1, 3, 5; 54:16; *T. Job* 43:16; *Apoc. Adam* 3:10-12). In 4 *Ezra* 7 the visionary sees what is in store for those who keep God's ways, when their souls are separated from their bodies: they will see the glory of God who receives them (91); their faces are to "shine like the sun" and they are to be incorruptible (97). The text reports that the glory of God will defend those who have lived a pure life (122), and that the righteous will receive the "greatest glory" (8.50).¹²⁴ *I Enoch* presents the change of the righteous in the presence of God. *I Enoch* 38:1-4 reports that those who possess the earth "will not be able to behold the faces of the holy ones" because "the light of the Lord of Spirits has shined on the face of the holy." *I Enoch* presents the eschatology of the righteous in terms of transformation and a dwelling with God (38:7-8): "I saw a dwelling place underneath the wings of the Lord of Spirit, and all the righteous and the elect before him shall be intense as the light of fire....my soul desired that dwelling place. Already my portion is there, for thus it has been reserved for me before the Lord of the Spirits."

2 *Baruch* 50-51, like *I Enoch*, refers to the glory of the righteous in connection to resurrection. *I Enoch* 62:13 states, "The righteous and elect ones shall be saved on that day...The Lord of the Spirits will abide over them...The righteous and elect shall rise from the earth...They shall wear garments of glory." 2 *Baruch* refers to the necessity of resurrection and the glory to follow for entering the heavenly realm.¹²⁵ 2 *Baruch* 50:2, 51:1, 3, states, "For the earth will surely give back the dead at that time...the glory of those that proved to be righteous will be changed...their splendor will be glorified by transformations, and the shape of their face will be changed into the light of their beauty so that they may acquire and receive the undying

¹²⁴ See discussion in Chibici-Revneanu, *Herrlichkeit*, 452.

¹²⁵ On which see Sprinkle, "The Afterlife in Romans," 208-11, 210.

world.”¹²⁶ The connection of resurrection and radiance appears already in Dan 12:2-3, “Many of those who sleep in the dust shall awake...and they will shine like the stars of heaven (φανοῦσιν ὡς φωστῆρες τοῦ οὐρανοῦ).”

Discernible within this discussion, then, are two broad strands related to glory and eschatology in the early Jewish material: first, the prophetic tradition of the renewal of Jerusalem, which involves the appearance of the glory of God in Jerusalem and the gathering of Israel and dealing with the nations; and, second, the apocalyptic tradition, which refers to the glorifying of the righteous, at times in connection with resurrection. In both traditions one observes the shining quality of God’s presence (i.e., Isa 60:1-2, 4 *Ezra* 7:91) and the notion that God’s presence makes its surroundings radiant (Jerusalem takes on radiance; Isa 60:13; *Ps. Sol* 17:31; Bar 5:1-5; the righteous take on radiance in divine presence, *1 En.* 38:4, 39:14). On the other hand, the traditions differ, in connection to glory, insofar as the prophetic eschatology highlights the glory of God in relation to Jerusalem, whereas in the apocalyptic tradition the focus is on the glorifying of the righteous.

Early Christian eschatological expectation shows parallels with the texts already discussed. The coming messiah is connected to glory in the synoptic Gospels: in line with *Psalms of Solomon* 17 (though not posing here any tradition-historical relationship), which refers to seeing the glory of the coming Messiah, the Gospels refer to the second coming of Jesus as “in” and “with” glory.¹²⁷ Matthew 19:28 and 25:31 refer to the “throne of glory” upon which the son of man will sit.¹²⁸ Glory appears in connection to resurrection (1 Cor 15:43; 1 Tim 3:16?; 1

¹²⁶ 2 *Baruch* refers to transformation into the splendor of angels and of stars (51:5, 10).

¹²⁷ Mark 8:38, 13:26 (cf. Mark 10:37); Matt 16:27, 19:28, 24:30, 25:31; Luke 9:26, 21:27. Jesus comes in the “glory of his father” (Mark 8:38; Matt 16:27; Luke 9:26, “of the father and of the holy angels”). The coming of Jesus “in glory” also plays an important role in Justin Martyr (*Dial.* 14, 31, 34, 35, 36, 49; cited in Chibici-Revneanu, *Herrlichkeit*, 452).

¹²⁸ Cf. “throne of glory” and “crown of glory” in 2 *Bar.* 15:8, 1QS IV, 7; 1 Pet 5:4.

Pet 1:11, 21). In Acts 3:13 the verb δοξάζω is used with reference to Jesus' resurrection: "The God of our ancestors has glorified his servant Jesus." Here glorification (as to honor, exalt; cf. ὑψόω in Acts 2:33, 5:31) and resurrection are identified, but this is not typical of references to glorification in early Jewish and Christian literature.¹²⁹ In the Gospel of John, Jesus' glorification is strongly linked with his death, in association with the "lifting up" of crucifixion (12:23, "the hour has come for the son of man to be glorified"; ὑψόω in John 8:28, 12:32-34).¹³⁰

In addition to its association of glory and Jesus, the early Christian eschatology envisions a future experience of glory for the righteous. This glory is Christological in the sense that the glory is analogous to the glory Christ has. This is clear in Phil 3:20-21, "He will transform the body of our humiliation that it may be conformed to the body of his glory"; Col 3:4, "When Christ who is your life is revealed, then you also will be revealed with him in glory." Matthew presents this in terms of foretelling the shining of the righteous and depicting Jesus' transfigured form in the same terms. In Matt 13:43, the text reports, "Then the righteous will shine like the sun (ἐκλάμπουσιν ὡς ὁ ἥλιος) in the kingdom of their Father." The language of shining like the sun appears again in Matt 17:2, in this case in reference to Jesus; Jesus "transformed before them, and his face "transformed before them, and his face shined as the sun (ἐλάμψεν τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ὡς ὁ ἥλιος), and his garments became bright as light" (cf. Mark 9:3; 2 Pet 1:16-18; Luke 9:29; 9:31, "they appeared in glory [οἱ ὀφθέντες ἐν δόξῃ]").¹³¹ Colossians 1:12 refers to sharing in the inheritance of the "saints in the light." The future transformation into a glorious form happens when Christ appears. This is the consistent time referent for the eschatological

¹²⁹ Resurrection and glorification are distinguished; see apocalyptic texts cited above and early Christian texts discussed below.

¹³⁰ Frey, "The Use of δόξα," 99-103.

¹³¹ Further on the brilliance of the post resurrection Jesus, see Rev 1:16, "His face was like the sun shining with full force."

transformation into glory, as clear in Phil 3:20-21 and Col 3:4, already mentioned, as well as 1 Pet 5:4, “When the chief shepherd appears, you will win the crown of glory that never fades away” and 1 John 3:2-3, with the language of being like him, “When he is revealed, we will be like him, for we will see him as he is.”

Related to this, there is a convention of transformation into a glorious form by virtue of being in the presence of God and Jesus. This naturally fits alongside the early Jewish eschatological expectation, according to which the radiant glory of God causes its surroundings to shine. Additionally, it squares with the association of glory and divine presence within early Christian parlance: glory means divine presence in many texts, i.e, 1 Thess 2:12, “[God] called you into his kingdom and glory”; 1 Pet 4:14, “spirit of glory, which is the spirit of God, resting on you,” 5:10, “called you into his eternal glory in Christ”; 2 Pet 1:17, the Majestic Glory, God, speaks; Tit 2:13, “the manifestation of the glory (ἐπιφάνειαν τῆς δόξης) of our great God and Savior Jesus Christ.” Transformation into glory in divine presence is in view in the letters of Paul, discussed in the next chapters. This convention also appears in 2 Thess 1:12, “So that the name of our Lord Jesus may be glorified in you (ἐνδοξασθῇ ἐν ὑμῖν), and you in him”; Col 1:27, “Christ in you, the hope of glory” (cf. 3:10); 1 John 3:2-3, “we will be like him, for we will see him as he is”; and Eph 5:27, where presenting the church to God “in glory” has in view both God’s glory as presence and the glory the righteous take on by virtue of being in God’s presence.

In relation to this, certain texts associate eschatological glory with purity. This is connected to the believers as temple motif as well as the idea of believer’s dwelling in the future eschatological temple. We may explore the texts attesting to these associations in certain detail (setting the undisputed letters of Paul, which are relevant in this regard, momentarily to the side). Ephesians presents the Jesus as sacrifice motif that makes access to divine presence for believers

possible. This is discernible in view of 2:13, “You who were once far off have been brought near by the blood of Christ,” 2:18, “For through him both of us have access in one Spirit to the Father,” and 5:2, Christ is a “an offering and sacrifice to God for a sweet-smelling fragrance.” This is connected with the image of believers as a temple of the Lord (2:21-22): believers are built into a “dwelling place for God by the spirit.” In Eph 5:25-27 the idea of purity necessary for enjoyment of divine presence is connected to the language of glory: Christ “gave himself up” for the church, “in order to make her holy (ἵνα αὐτὴν ἀγιάσῃ)...so as to present the church to himself in glory (ἵνα παραστήσῃ αὐτὸς ἑαυτῷ ἑνδοξον), without a spot or wrinkle...yes, so that she may be holy and without blemish (ἵνα ᾗ ἁγία καὶ ἄμωμος).” The present eschatology of Ephesians 2, with its reference to the temple with believers and God, is here transposed onto the future, where believers through Jesus’ blood (also “washing of word by the word”) are pure and thus able to enter the heavenly temple, where God’s glory resides. The same framework (believers-purity-divine presence-temple) appears in 1:4, “He chose us in Christ before the foundation of the world to be holy and blameless before him (ἁγίους καὶ ἄμώμους κατενώπιον αὐτοῦ).”

This purity and eschatological divine presence framework is also present in Revelation 21, the narrative of the new heaven and new earth, which, among other things, shows the influence of the prophetic tradition of the renewal of Jerusalem. Purity concerns appear in connection to 21:8, where the “cowardly, faithless, polluted, murderers, fornicators, sorcerers, idolaters...” (those who are morally impure) are excluded from the new city. This is associated with the recognition that God dwells in the city (21:3), “The home of God is among mortals, he will dwell with them as their God.” The city “has the glory of God” (22:11); the glory of God is the light of the city (23). In 21:27 the impurity dynamic is again affirmed: “Nothing unclean (πᾶν

κοινὸν) will enter it, nor anyone who practices abomination or falsehood (ποιῶν βδέλυγμα καὶ ψεῦδος), but only those who are written in the Lamb's book of life." As in Ephesians, we see here the motif of the eschatological temple and the connection to the necessity of purity and reference to glory as divine presence.

Further examples and potential examples of the motif may be noted. Hebrews presents, like Ephesians, the Jesus as sacrifice motif. In Heb 10:19 this is connected to access to divine presence: "We have confidence to enter the sanctuary by the blood of Jesus...Let us approach with true heart...with our hearts sprinkled clean from an evil conscience and our bodies washed with pure water." 1 Peter 3:18 appears to follow this convention, though the language of purity does not appear in the immediate context: "For Christ also suffered for sins once for all, the righteous for the unrighteous, in order to bring you to God." Certain texts refer to purity in connection to God and Jesus' future eschatological presence, where it is possible that purity language is not used in terms of moral purity but in terms of being given a good verdict at the eschatological judgment. These are Jude 24, "Now to him who is able to keep you from falling, and to make you stand without blemish in the presence of his glory (στῆσαι κατενώπιον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ ἀμώμους)," and Col 1:21-22, "And you who were once estranged and hostile in mind, doing evil deeds, he has now reconciled in his fleshly body through death, so as to present you holy and blameless before him." The Jude passage in particular appears to use the language of purity in relation to eschatological judgment; the language of "standing" (cf. Acts 25:10; Rom 14:4, 10; Rev 20:12; 2 Pet 3:11-13), and the lack of reference to purity ideas elsewhere in the passage, suggest this. The Colossians passage, on the other hand, seems to have access to the temple/divine presence imagery in view. This is due to the lack of the judgment imagery or language in the immediate context and the theology of Colossians. Access to divine presence is

important in Colossians (Col 1:27, “Christ in you, the hope of glory”; Col 1:19, “in him the fullness of God was pleased to dwell,” 2:9; 2:6, “You have received Christ Jesus the Lord, continue to live your lives in him”). For these reasons, I hold that Col 1:22 does not refer to the “holy” and “blameless” as a future verdict offered with respect to believers at the eschaton but rather as the purity necessary for being “before him,” that is, currently in God’s presence. In this case Jesus’ death again has the ritual function of making possible access to God’s presence.

Two further examples are 1 John 3:2-3 and Titus 2:13-14, both which refer to the purity of believers following reference to divine presence; in 1 John 3:2-3, reference to “seeing” God and becoming like God precedes reference to “purifying” oneself; and, in Tit 2:13-14, there is reference to the hope of the manifestation of “the glory of our great God and Savior, Jesus Christ,” before remarking on Jesus agency to purify people, “redeem us from all iniquity and purify for himself a people of his own.” In these cases, the necessity of moral purity for being in divine presence appears to be affirmed. These could be read as not attesting to this logic; one might read the references to purity and divine presence as disjointed or not related in terms of purity necessary for divine presence; however, the proximity of the references to the two are, in my view, telling, and, given the prevalence of the motif within the early Christian literature, it is reasonable to see the convention attested here as well. Regardless of how one reads 1 John 3 and Titus 2, it is clear that within the early Christian context a motif of eschatological temple, where believers’ moral purity is necessary for enjoyment of divine presence, developed, and that the language of glory as divine presence, which necessitates believers’ purity, regularly featured within this motif.

2.4 Primeval Humanity

The final discourse to consider here is the discourse of primeval humanity, which concerns how humankind began and the nature of their earliest existence.¹³² The language of glory did not play a prominent role in this discourse in general in the ancient world (at least, not in a way that scholarship has detected). However, glory was in specific Jewish texts associated with Adam and Eve, and this should be remarked on in this context. Certain texts refer to the loss of Adam's glory as a divestment of clothes: *Apoc. Mos.* 20:1-2; *3 Bar* 4:16; *Tg. Ps.-J Gen* 2:25; and *Gen. Rab.* 12:6 on 2:4.¹³³ In the view of James Kugel, these texts reflect an interpretation of

¹³² W. K. C. Guthrie, *In the Beginning: Some Greek Views on the Origins of Life and the Early State of Man* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1957); John Van Seters, *Prologue to History: The Yahwist as Historian in Genesis* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1992) 45-103; Gordon Campbell, *Lucretius on Creation and Evolution: A Commentary on De Rerum Natura Book Five, Lines 772-1104* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003) 9-15. Specifically on the reception of the Adam narrative: Jacob Jervell, *Imago Dei*, 15-170; Levison, *Portraits of Adam in Early Judaism*; James L. Kugel, *Traditions of the Bible: A Guide to the Bible As It Was at the Start of the Common Era* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1998); Van Kooten, *Paul's Anthropology in Context*, 1-91; Grant Macaskill, *Union with Christ in the New Testament* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014) 129-43.

¹³³ *Apoc. Mos.* 20:1-2: [Eve to the serpent] At that very moment my eyes were opened and I knew that I was naked of the righteousness with which I had been clothed. And I wept saying, 'Why have you done this to me, that I have been estranged from my glory with which I was clothed (ἀπηλλοτριώθην ἐκ τῆς δόξης μου, ἣς ἤμην ἐνδεδυμένη)?'

Apoc. Mos. 21:6: He ate, and his eyes were opened, and he also realized his nakedness. And he said to me [Eve], 'O evil woman! Why have you wrought destruction among us? You have estranged me from the glory of God (ἀπηλλοτριώσάς με ἐκ τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ).'

3 (Greek) Bar. 4:16-17: Then know, Baruch, that just as Adam through this tree was condemned and stripped naked of the glory of God (καὶ τῆς δόξης θεοῦ ἐψυμνώθη), thus people now who insatiably drink from the wine deriving from it transgress worse than Adam, and become distant from the glory of God (τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ δόξης μακρὰν γίνονται), and will secure for themselves eternal fire."

Tg. Ps.-J. Gen 2:25: And the two of them were wise, Adam and his wife, but they did not remain in their glory" (cf. 3:7).

Gen. Rab. 12:6 on 2:4: The [missing] six [that is, the numerical value of the *vav*] correspond to six things that were taken away from the first man, and these are they: his splendor, his immortal life, his stature, the fruit of the earth, the fruit of the tree, and the primordial lights...His glory lasted for the night, and at the end of the Sabbath his splendor was taken from him and he was driven from the Garden of Eden." Translation in Jacob Neusner, *Genesis Rabbah: The Judaic Commentary to the Book of Genesis: A New American Translation* (BJS 105: Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985) 2.124-25.

Further texts cited in this connection are *Apoc. Sedr.* 6.5 and *T. Ps.-J. Gen* 3:7 (Blackwell, "Immortal Glory and the Problem of Death in Rom 3.23," 289). However, *Apocalypse of Sedrach* uses glory as divine presence, and the reading of *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan* rests on a controversial account of the Aramaic (on which see Maher, *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan*, 26n.12).

Gen 3:7 (“They knew that they were naked”), according to which Adam and Eve did not gain new knowledge after eating the forbidden fruit in the Garden (i.e., they learned they were naked), but that Adam and Eve were in a new condition, that is, they were for the first time naked, and the clothing they had lost was a garment of glory.¹³⁴

Adam’s loss of glory features as a central aspect of the narrative of *Apocalypse of Moses* 20-21. The text reports, from the perspective of Eve (20:1-2), “At that very moment my eyes were opened and I knew that I was naked of the righteousness with which I was clothed. And I wept saying [to the Tempter], ‘Why have you done this to me, that I have been estranged from my glory with which I was clothed (ἀπηλλοτριώθην ἐκ τῆς δόξης μου, ἧς ἤμην ἐνδεδυμένη)’” The text reports concerning glory in 21:2, with Eve speaking, “I spoke to him unlawful words of transgression such as brought us down from great glory (κατήγαγον ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ μεγάλης δόξης).” In 21:6, further, Adam states, “O evil woman, why have you wrought destruction among us? You have separated me from the glory of God (ἀπηλλοτριώσάς με ἐκ τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ).” In 20:1-2 there is a clear reference to glory as a garment; the verb ἐνδύω communicates this. However, glory in 21:2 and 21:6 may not refer to a garment. The verbs in these cases appear to indicate a movement away from a thing or place; in the case of 21:2, movement away from a place of elevation.¹³⁵ The reference to glory in 21:6 may still refer to a garment; it is possible that one has been separated from glory as something that is worn. However, the reading of glory as

¹³⁴ Kugel, *Traditions of the Bible*, 114-20. Kugel theorizes (115) that this way of reading Gen 3:7 developed due to then-prevalent Jewish sensitivities about nakedness. This reading makes its way into the early Christian commentator Ephrem: “It was because of the glory with which they were clothed that they were not ashamed. When it was taken away from them...they were indeed ashamed, because they were [now] naked” (cited in Kugel, 116).

¹³⁵ Thus, Jan Doehhorn, *Die Apokalypse of Mose* (TSAJ 106; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005) 360-61.

garment in 21:2 is unlikely given that the verb “to bring down” makes this conceptually problematic.

Related to this, we may explore the nature of the glory in each case. Preston Sprinkle held that “righteousness” is a plausible understanding of glory in view of 20:1-2, but that the predominant meaning conveyed by glory in these passages is immortality.¹³⁶ The theory that glory means righteousness or immortality, however, infringes upon the recognition that language users are not free unilaterally to introduce new meanings to words.¹³⁷ Sprinkle does not demonstrate the sense “immortality” for glory in the early Jewish context. Further, Sprinkle wrongly dismisses the possibility of glory as splendor in chs. 20-21 on the basis that “there is no speculation in *Apoc. Mos.* regarding Adam’s remarkable physical appearance.” The use of δόξα in 20:1-2 could itself signal an interest in Adam and Eve’s physical appearance, that is, insofar as it may refer to their garment of glory (radiance) before the transgression. That glory means radiance in these contexts is supported by the recognition that glory means radiance in 18:5 and 33:2, in connection to the tree and “four radiant eagles,” respectively.¹³⁸ In view of this, as well as the tradition of referring to Adam and Eve’s radiant garments in other texts, it is plausible to read the glory of God as referring to garments of radiance in *Apoc. Mos.* 20:1-2.¹³⁹ With respect to 21:2 and 21:6, 21:6 could refer to glory as a garment; however, glory could here instead refer to Adam’s estrangement from divine presence; and 21:2 may refer to the high status of Adam or perhaps a place of glory from which Adam and Eve fell.

¹³⁶ Sprinkle, “The Afterlife in Romans,” 205-06.

¹³⁷ As discussed in the introduction, in connection to Saussure.

¹³⁸ *Apoc. Mos.* 18:5, “seeing” the “great glory around” the tree (ὄψει δόξαν μεγάλην περὶ αὐτοῦ); 33:2, “four radiant eagles,” and none can “tell of their glory or see their faces (εἰπεῖν τὴν δόξαν αὐτῶν οὐτε ἰδεῖν τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτῶν)

¹³⁹ Thus, Andrew T. Lincoln, *Paradise Now and Not Yet* (SNTSMS 43; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981) 43

The idea of Adam with original glory appears, as well, in the *Testament of Abraham* and the *Apocalypse of Adam*. The *Testament of Abraham* refers to Adam's glorious garments (Rec. A. 11:8-9), "Who is this wondrous man, who is adorned is such glory? The incorporeal one said, 'This is the first-formed Adam who is in such glory...'" *Apocalypse of Adam* 1:5 offers a gnostic interpretation of Adam's glory: "God...separated us [Adam and Eve] wrathfully. Then we became two aeons, and the glory in our hearts deserted us." Here again there appears the motif of distance from glory; in this case the glory moves away from Adam and Eve.¹⁴⁰

Certain texts from the Dead Sea Scrolls offer perspective from texts earlier than those discussed thus far. The texts refer not to Adam's original glory but to Adam's glory as an eschatological hope, "all the glory of Adam" (1QS IV, 23; CD III, 20; 1QH^a IV, 27). We see in these texts an association of glory with eternal life, as in CD III, 20, "Those who remained steadfast in it will acquire eternal life, and all the glory of Adam is for them"; 1QH^a IV, 27, "Casting away all their iniquities, giving them as a legacy all the glory of Adam [and] abundance of days." However, the texts do not go so far as to equate glory with immortality; the two remain distinct. This distinction is upheld in 1QS IV, 6-8, which references future eternal life alongside future experience of light: "The reward of all those who walk in it will be healing, plentiful peace in a long life...eternal enjoyment with endless life, and a crown of glory with majestic raiment in eternal light."

Importantly, the texts from the Scrolls do not conflate Adam's glory with God's glory. The closest the Scrolls come to this is 4Q504 8,4, with reference to Adam's creation: "[...Adam,] our [fa]ther, you fashioned in the image of [your] glory." Yet, the text does not attribute God's glory to Adam. Rather, the image of God's glory is the model according to which

¹⁴⁰ Cited in Grindheim, "A Theology of Glory," 454.

God fashioned Adam.¹⁴¹ A further text referring to Adam in connection to glory is Ben Sira 49:16. The text states, “Shem and Seth were honored among people, but above every living thing in creation is Adam (Σημ καὶ Σηθ ἐν ἀνθρώποις ἐδοξάσθησαν, καὶ ὑπὲρ πάντων ζῶον ἐν τῇ κτίσει Ἀδὰμ).” The text attributes honor to Adam in glory terms, but this text does not reflect an association of Adam and glory in the terms observed in the *Apoc. Mos.*, *3 Bar.*, or the Dead Sea Scrolls. This presentation rather reflects the author of Ben Sira’s larger rhetorical aim, particularly, in the case of Ben Sira 49, as part of the framework of the encomium of Israel’s heroes in Ben Sira 44-50. Within this, the author attributes honor to Adam as being the first in the lineage of Abrahamic heroes.¹⁴² This, rather than the idea of Adam’s original glory or the hope of enjoying the future glory of Adam, stands behind Ben Sira’s assignment of glory to Adam.

Thus, we see, in connection to glory and Adam, as discussed in John Levison, authors’ willingness to use the features of the Genesis 1-3 in various ways in line with their own agenda.¹⁴³ Still, certain conventional perspectives may be cited. There was in the DSS an expectation of enjoyment of the future glory of Adam, which was associated with eternal life. The Dead Sea Scrolls, however, do not show an interest in Adam’s original glory or attribute the glory of God to Adam, as in *Apocalypse of Moses* and other later sources. The *Apocalypse of Moses*, along with other texts such as *Testament of Abraham* and *Apocalypse of Adam*, refer to the original glory of Adam and to the loss of this glory. This is presented in terms of divestment of a garment and in terms of a distancing of glory and Adam and Eve; whether Adam and Eve

¹⁴¹ Thus, Van Kooten, *Paul’s Anthropology in Context*, 22-23; Grindheim, “Theology of Glory,” 453-55; against Crispin H. T. Fletcher-Louis, *All the Glory of Adam: Liturgical Anthropology in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 42; Leiden: Brill, 2002) 93.

¹⁴² On which see Levison, *Portraits of Adam*, 45; Macaskill, *Union with Christ*, 137-38.

¹⁴³ Levison, *Portraits of Adam*, 145-62; discussed in ch. 1 section 3.

move away (*Apoc. Mos.* 21:6) or the glory moves (*Apoc. Adam* 1.5). The texts referring to Adam's experiencing of the glory of God, that is, specifically divine glory, are *Apoc. Mos.* 20:1-2, 21:6, and *3 Bar.* 4:16. In these cases, the glory of God is (in *Apoc Mos.* 20:1-2 and *3 Bar.* 4:16, definitely; in *Apoc. Mos.* 21:6, possibly) a garment, arguably of radiance, of which Adam and Eve are divested.

Conclusion

We highlighted in this discussion the meanings of glory from a lexicographical perspective and then, through treatment of discourses in which the language of glory functioned, the conceptual associations of the language. We noted the meanings “opinion,” “reputation,” “radiance,” and “divine presence,” and we highlighted conventions related to the language within discussion of honor and shame, cultic purity and divine presence, eschatological expectation, and primeval humanity. In the next chapter we continue the discussion by examining the language of glory in Paul excluding the letter to the Romans. Not including Romans, the language occurs 48 times in Paul's letters.¹⁴⁴ The next chapter considers the employment of the language in these instances, with attention in the first instance to the broader themes in relation to which to understand glory and then focused attention to the specific literary contexts where the language appears.

¹⁴⁴ Δόξα: 1 Thess 2:6, 12, 20; Gal 1:5; 1 Cor 2:7, 8, 10:31, 11:7 (2x), 15, 15:40, 41 (4x), 43; 2 Cor 1:20, 3:7 (2x), 8, 9 (2x), 10, 11 (2x), 18 (3x), 4:4, 6, 15, 17, 6:8, 8:19, 23; Phil 1:11, 2:11, 3:19, 21, 4:19, 20. Δοξάζω: Gal 1:24; 1 Cor 6:20, 12:26; 2 Cor 3:10 (2x), 9:13. Ἐνδοξος: 1 Cor 4:10.

3. Glory in the Letters of Paul Excluding Romans

In the last chapter we highlighted the semantic and conceptual profile of the language of glory as it was used in general in the ancient context and specifically within early Jewish and Christian parlance. As discussed there, glory carried certain meanings, “opinion,” “honor,” “radiance,” “divine presence,” in ancient use (certain of these, specifically within the Jewish and Christian context), and it bore certain discernable conceptual associations, which we explored in terms of discourse of which the language of glory was part. In this chapter we consider the use of the language of glory generally in the letters of Paul, excluding Romans, the object of enquiry in chapters 4 and 5. The chapter considers the five other undisputed letters of Paul that feature the language of glory (1 Thess; 1 Cor; 2 Cor; Gal; Phil). In this connection we are presented with contingent letters behind which stand their own circumstances and which present their own argumentative logics. While not diminishing the significance of these observations, I highlight here particular themes and patterns of speech that appear across Paul’s letters and in relation to which the language of glory in Paul’s parlance may be understood.

Thus, in this chapter, we consider the language of glory in Paul, first through examination of certain themes that are illuminating in relation to glory, and, second, by examination of the specific literary contexts in which the language of glory appears. The themes explored are: Believers as Pure and Holy; The Overlap of Ages; God as Patron and Benefactor; and Honor Within the Group. I then explore the specific literary contexts where the language of glory appears under several headings: The Process of Transformation; Eschatological Glory; Glory to God; and Glory as Esteem among People.

1. Themes

1.1 Believers as Pure and Holy

Paul employs conventions of cultic purity and divine presence in writing to his communities.¹ 1 Thessalonians and the Corinthian correspondence indicate that Paul couched his initial teaching and preaching in terms of purity and proximity to God. Paul states to the Thessalonians by way of reminder that God desires their holiness.² Likewise, 1 Corinthians 6:11 presents baptism as having a purifying function, which suggests that Paul introduced baptism to his communities as having this purpose.³ Further, in all three letters Paul refers to the necessity of ongoing purity on account of the presence of God within the community. In 1 Thess 4:7-8 Paul states, after telling readers, “God did not call us to impurity but to holiness (οὐ γὰρ ἐκάλεσεν ἡμᾶς ὁ θεὸς ἐπὶ ἀκαθαρσία ἀλλ’ ἐν ἁγιασμῷ),” that “whoever rejects this...rejects God, who gives his holy spirit to you.” The logic is that God’s spirit is in the midst of the believers, and thus they must remain pure by following Paul’s directives concerning sex. The

¹ Michael Newton, *The Concept of Purity and Qumran and the Letters of Paul* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985) 82-83; David A. Renwick, *Paul, the Temple, and the Presence of God* (BJS 224; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991); Stephen Finlan, *The Background and Content of Paul’s Cultic Atonement Metaphors* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2004); Klawans, *Impurity and Sin*, 150-57; Martin Vahrenhorst, *Kultische Sprache in den Paulusbrieffen* (WUNT 230; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008); Kathy Ehrensperger, “‘Called to Be Saints’ – The Identity Shaping Dimension of Paul’s Priestly Discourse in Romans,” in *Reading Paul in Context: Explorations in Identity Formation* (LNTS; London: T&T Clark, 2010) 90-110; Yulin Liu, *Temple Purity in 1-2 Corinthians*, 106-240; Sarah Whittle, “Purity in Paul,” in *Purity: Essays in Bible and Theology* (eds. Andrew Brower Latz and Arseny Ermakov; Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2014) 134-52; Blidstein, *Purity, Community, and Ritual*, 61-63, 68-71, 109-111, 137-40, 150-55; Paula Fredriksen, “Paul, Purity, and the *Ekklēsia* of the Gentiles,” in *The Beginnings of Christianity: A Collection of Articles* (eds. Jack Pastor and Menachem Mor; Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi, 2005) 205-17; Idem., *Paul*, 151-54.

² On the purity dynamic in 1 Thessalonians 4 (and its relation to Rom 1:18-32), see Stowers, *Rereading of Romans*, 97.

³ On baptism for Paul as cleansing moral defilement, see Klawans, *Impurity and Sin*, 154; Hayes, *Gentile Impurities and Jewish Identities*, 104 n. 17; Newton, *The Concept of Purity*, 81-83. Blidstein, *Purity, Community, and Ritual*, 110: “An action which in Judaism and other religions of the Empire was a preparatory ritual *before* entrance into a holy space or group became in Paul a ritual *of* entrance into the group: a ritual of sanctification with overtones of purification.”

statement, “Who gives his holy spirit to you,” adds the dynamic of the purity necessary for the holy space to Paul’s appeal.

The same logic appears in 1 Cor 3:16, 6:19, and 2 Cor 6:14-7:1. Paul refers to the necessity of maintaining the integrity of the community as the temple of God’s holy spirit. In 6:19 Paul refers to this amid discussion of sexual ethics: the person must remain pure by not having sex with a prostitute. Likewise, 2 Corinthians 6:14-7:1 is full of citations of scripture dealing with the necessity of purity for divine presence in reference to Israel, which Paul applies to the believing community.⁴ Believers are the temple of the holy spirit, so they must keep themselves pure.⁵ Paul does not go so far as to say that believers, if they continue in sin, would lose the spirit, but the force of the appeal appears based on this possibility.⁶

Paul’s preferred purity language for the status of his communities is ἅγιος and its cognates. Through baptism and entrance into the community people become ἅγιος and thus fit to

⁴ Lev 26:11-12; Ezek 37:27; Isa 52:11; Ezek 20:34. The authenticity of 2 Cor 6:14-7:1 is an old problem (on which see Margaret E. Thrall, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians* [ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994] 1.25-36; Martin Vogel, “Versöhnung und Streit: Notizen zur Literarkritik des 2. Korintherbriefes in der neueren Forschung,” in *Spurensuche zur Einleitung in das Neue Testament: Eine Festschrift im Dialog mit Udo Schnelle* [ed. Michael Labahn; FRLANT 271; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2017] 87-107). N. H. Taylor (“The Composition and Chronology of 2 Corinthians” *JSNT* 44 [1991] 75-78) highlighted that the passage is fully compatible with Paul and shows affinities with ideas expressed earlier in the Corinthian correspondence. E. P. Sanders, in his recent large-scale treatment of Paul (*Paul: The Apostle’s Life, Letters, and Thought* [Minneapolis: Fortress, 2015] 230-31, 235), adopts the view that the section preserves part of the letter mentioned in 1 Cor 5:9 (a position also taken, tentatively, in Paul B. Duff, *Moses in Corinth: The Apologetic Context of 2 Corinthians 3* [NovTSup 159; Leiden: Brill, 2015] 35).

⁵ Thrall, *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, I.36, on 2 Cor 6:14-7:1: “They must strive to achieve and maintain the holiness proper to God’s covenant people (Lev 19:2). If they are inheritors of divine promises (1.20), amongst whom the promise of God’s indwelling is realized, then they must maintain the purity appropriate to the community which constitutes God’s temple.”

⁶ Thus, Klawans, *Impurity and Sin*, 154-55, “The effect of moral impurity is felt in the new community in the same way as it was perceived, by Jews, to affect the temple. Paul also repeatedly expresses his belief that the spirit of God rests upon the new community (Rom 8:9). When we recall that the tannaim believed that God’s *Shekhinah* would depart from the temple defiled by sin, one must also wonder: Is it possible that Paul believed in a similar idea, that God’s Presence—or Spirit—would be removed from a sinful community? Is that what lay behind the reference to God’s Spirit dwelling among the community in 1 Corinthians 3:16? I suspect that Paul may indeed have believed in such a notion.”

be in the presence of God.⁷ Before, the gentiles to which Paul writes were ἀκάθαρτος and participated in ἀκαθαρσία, and the key forms of ἀκαθαρσία for Paul are sexual immorality and idolatry.⁸ For Paul moral purity is contagious, just as moral impurity is contagious.⁹ Paul shows the connection of impurity with divine wrath and the language of justice/injustice and piety/impiety that is reflected in the broader context of literature.¹⁰ For Paul believers must maintain their purity for the sake of the eschaton. As became conventional in early Christian sources, Paul referred not only to the purity necessary for present enjoyment of divine presence¹¹ but also the requirement of purity in the presence of God and Jesus at the final judgment (1 Thess 5:23): “May the God of peace sanctify (ἀγιάσαι) you entirely, and may your spirit and soul and body be kept blameless (ἀμέμπτως) at the coming of our Lord Jesus.”¹² Paul, then, consistently

⁷ On the language of purity in Paul, see Whittle, “Purity in Paul,” 140-44. The idea of entrance into the community and the relation of this to divine presence was recently emphasized in Fredricksen, *Paul*, 151-54.

⁸ See 1 Cor 7:14 on the binary of ἀκάθαρτος and ἅγιος. Moshe Blidstein notes that Paul uses the language of holiness almost synonymously with purity and the language of profaneness almost synonymously with impurity (see Rom 14:14, 20). Thus, while other Jewish sources observe the strict binaries holy/profane and pure/impure, Paul presents a “much simpler dualist system” composed of holy and pure on the one hand and common and impure on the other (Blidstein, *Purity, Community, and Ritual*, 111). On sexual immorality and idolatry as morally defiling, see 1 Thess 4:2-8, “control your body in holiness and honor,” not like the “gentiles who do not know God”; 1 Cor 6:9-11; 2 Cor 12:21; Gal 5:19-21; Rom 1:18-32, 6:19-20, “Just as you presented your members as slaves of impurity and to greater and greater iniquity.” Klawans, *Impurity and Sin*, 155, “Paul believed that sexual and, perhaps, idolatrous sins would defile sinners and—in place of the land of Israel and temple in Jerusalem—the new communities constituted by those who believed in Jesus.”

⁹ See 1 Cor 7:14: the unbelieving spouse is made holy by their spouse; the children are likewise holy through their parents. On impurity as contagious, see 1 Cor 5:1-13: (9) “do not even eat with such a person”; (7) “clean out the old yeast (ἐκκαθάρατε τὴν παλαιὰν ζύμην)”; (13) “drive out the evil from among you (ἐξάρατε τὸν πονηρὸν ἐξ ὑμῶν αὐτῶν).” On which see Whittle, “Purity in Paul,” 146-48.

¹⁰ 1 Thess 2:10, “in what manner we became pure and righteous and blameless (ὡς ὁσίως καὶ δικαίως καὶ ἀμέμπτως) towards you believers”; 1 Thess 4:1-8; 1 Cor 6:11; Rom 1:18-32, 6:19-20; Phil 1:10-11. See chapter 2 section 2.3.

¹¹ Cf. Tatian, *Orat.* 13, “but, the spirit of God is not with all, but, taking up its abode with those who live justly,” 15-16, “Such is the nature of man’s constitution; and, if it be like a temple, God is pleased to dwell in it by the spirit”; *Acts Thom.* 12, 87, 156: through rejection of sexuality one can become a temple (cf. *Acts of Paul and Thecla* 5). Cited in Blidstein, *Purity, Community, and Ritual*, 158, 161, 175.

¹² 1 Thess 3:13, “May he so strengthen your hearts in holiness (ἐν ἀγιωσύνῃ) that you may be blameless (ἀμέμπτους) before our God and Father at the coming of our Lord Jesus will all his saints”; Phil

shows the connection of the idea of divine presence with purity, as in other early Jewish and Christian authors.

1.2 The Overlap of Ages

For Paul, the future, blessed age is drawn partially into the present following Jesus' death and resurrection but the former age remains present in certain ways until Christ's second coming.¹³ This is evident through examination of Paul's references to time. Galatians 1:4 states that Christ gave himself to "set us free from the present evil age" and 2 Cor 6:2 states, "Now is the acceptable now, now is the day of salvation!" Yet Rom 13:12 states, "Salvation is nearer to us than when we became believers; the night is far gone, the day is near," implying that the day of salvation has not yet come.¹⁴ The dimension also comes through in Paul's use of language related to salvation. The indwelling spirit is both constitutive of present salvation and a "guarantee" and "firstfruits" of future salvation (2 Cor 1:22, 5:5; Rom 8:23; cf. Rom 5:5);¹⁵ through baptism people die and are "raised to walk in newness of life" (Rom 6:1-11), yet resurrection is still future; God is at work within the community through the spirit, but so is the flesh and sin (Gal 5:16-26; Rom 6:11-14). There is correspondence between the present and

1:10-11, "That in the day of Christ you may be pure and blameless (εὐλκρινεῖς καὶ ἀπρόσκοποι)." Cf. Col 1:22; Eph 1:4; Jude 24; Rev 21:27; chapter 2 section 2.4.

¹³ See Oscar Cullmann, *Christ and Time: The Primitive Christian Conception of Time and History* (trans. Floyd V. Filson; rev. ed.; London: SCM Press, 1962); Dunn, *Theology of Paul*, 461-72; Oda Wischmeyer, "Konzepte von Zeit bei Paulus und im Markusevangelium," in *Paul and Mark: Comparative Essays. Part I, Two Authors at the Beginning of Christianity* (eds. Oda Wischmeyer et al.; BZNW 198; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2014) 361-92; Loren T. Stuckenbruck, ("Posturing 'Apocalyptic' in Pauline Theology: How Much Contrast to Jewish Tradition?" in *The Myth of Rebellious Angels* [WUNT 335; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014] 241-56) counters the claim that this view was novel to the early followers of Jesus and to Paul (254): "The 'already' principle of evil's defeat and the 'not yet' of its manifest destruction was an existing framework that Paul could take for granted."

¹⁴ On time language in Paul see, i.e., 1 Thess 4:15-18, Gal 4:4, 1 Cor 7:26, 15:52; Rom 8:8, 16:20; Oda Wischmeyer, "Konzepte von Zeit," 366-67.

¹⁵ On which see Gordon D. Fee, *God's Empowering Presence: The Holy Spirit in the Letters of Paul* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1994) 806-07.

future enjoyment of eschatological blessing: the future blessing is a continuation and amplification of the present one.¹⁶ The future age comes in fullness and all negative remnants of the past age are gone once Christ comes and God defeats all God's enemies (1 Cor 15:24-28; Rom 16:20).

1.3 God as Patron and Benefactor

Paul regularly employs the language and ideas of divine patronage in relation to God.¹⁷ God and Jesus "give" on behalf of the community and Paul and the people "receive" from God.¹⁸ The provision of God as benefactor is comprehensive: "My God will supply fully your every need according to his riches...in Christ Jesus" (Phil 4:19; cf. Rom 8:32). God is the patron not only of the community but of the whole world.¹⁹ The most important term in Paul's lexicon of divine benefaction is χάρις.²⁰ For Paul, the central form of benefaction from God is salvation that comes through Jesus. Paul uses the word grace in relation to the initial act of salvation, Christ's

¹⁶ Implied with language "firstfruits" (Rom 8:23; Christ's resurrection, 1 Cor 15:23). The presence of God is already on the scene providing life and combatting evil (the spirit; Gal 3:5; see also 1 Cor 14:25, "God is really among you!"); God comes in fullness at the eschaton and defeats enemies for good (1 Cor 15:24-28; Rom 16:20; see Beverly Gaventa, "The 'Glory of God,'" 29-40). Sören Agersnap (*Baptism and the New Life: A Study of Romans 6:1-14* [Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 1999] 401) states that for Paul the language "already/not yet," found in Dunn, *Theology of Paul*, 466-72, is better termed "already/even more." Cited and followed in Udo Schnelle, *Theology of the New Testament* (trans. M. Eugene Boring; Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2009) 344 n. 444.

¹⁷ Barclay, *Paul and the Gift*, 331-574; Harrison, *Paul's Language of Grace*; Neyrey, "God, Benefactor and Patron"; James D. G. Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998) 319-23.

¹⁸ 1 Cor 1:4, 15:57; 2 Cor 2:21; Rom 8:32; Jesus "gives" himself according to the will of God (Gal 1:4); 1 Thess 1:10, "Jesus, who rescues us from the coming wrath." Paul presents his calling (Gal 1:15-17; Rom 1:5), direction (1 Cor 16:8-9; 2 Cor 2:12; cf. Col 4:3), and success (1 Cor 2:1-5; Rom 15:17-18) as entirely dependent on God.

¹⁹ 1 Cor 11:12, "All things come from God"; Rom 11:36, "From whom and through whom and to whom are all things. To him be the glory forever (αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας). Amen."

²⁰ Dunn, *Theology of Paul*, 319-23; Barclay, *Paul and the Gift*, 331-33, 449-52.

death (2 Cor 8:9), and also referring to ongoing divine enablement and commissioning.²¹

Concerning the idea of a return for God's beneficence, Paul refers to thanksgiving to God and necessary obedience and conformity.²² Paul refers to God's benefaction repeatedly in the discussion of contributing to the collection and speaks of the "fear of the Lord" in relation to not fulfilling his commission as an apostle (2 Cor 5:11).²³ In attributing esteem to God, Paul uses the language of thanksgiving and glory over the language of honor and praise.²⁴ Paul's presentation of divine patronage indicates that, for him, as with Philo, Josephus, *Wisdom of Solomon*, and other Jewish authors, God is the supreme patron to whom honor and allegiance are due.²⁵

1.4 Honor within the Group

Paul, further, shows awareness of and addresses dynamics of honor and status within his communities.²⁶ Paul presents himself as a person of honor and authority: he is an apostle; his gospel is of divine origin (Gal 1:10-11); he is not in the least inferior to the "super-apostles" (2 Cor 11:5, 12:11). Paul appeals to his clout in correspondence with Philemon. He has the

²¹ 1 Cor 1:4-7, 2:12 3:10; 2 Cor 1:18-32, 5:18, 6:1, 8:1, 9:5, 12:9; Rom 8:32, 12:6; Phil 1:7, 28; see further lists in James D. G. Dunn, *The Theology of Paul*, 320 and n. 11-14.

²² Barclay highlights the "incongruity," in Romans and Galatians, of Paul's presentation of the benefaction of God. Yet, to continue using Barclay's terms, Paul does not "perfect" the "non-circularity" of the gift, i.e., in a way that would "rule out the significance of the believers' works as the necessary response to grace" (Barclay, *Paul and the Gift*, 465; on perfections of grace, see 70-75).

²³ Neyrey highlights the patron-client hierarchy suggested by relationships such as teacher/student, godfather/godchild, and lord/vassal. Neyrey, "God, Benefactor and Patron," 467, 471-75. Rom 13:7, "Respect (φόβος) to whom respect is due, honor to whom honor is due."

²⁴ Thanksgiving (εὐχαριστία and χάρις): 1 Thess 1:2, 2:13, 3:9 5:18; 1 Cor 1:4, 14, 10:30 14:16, 17, 18, 15:57; 2 Cor 1:11, 4:15, 8:16, 9:11, 12, 15; Rom 1:8, 1:21, 6:17, 7:2, 14:6 (2x); Phil 1:3, 4:6; Phlm 4. One instance of ἔπαινος (Phil 1:11), "To the glory and praise of God." Τιμή and τιμάω as honor to God does not appear in Paul (cf. 1 Tim 1:17).

²⁵ The dynamic of reciprocity within Paul's account of divine benefaction lines up with the reciprocal dynamic of faith (πίστις) in Paul, on which see Morgan, *Roman Faith and Christian Faith*, 212-306.

²⁶ On which see Hellermann, *Reconstructing Honor in Roman Philippi*; Mark T. Finney, *Honour and Conflict in the Ancient World: 1 Corinthians in its Greco-Roman Social Setting* (LNTS; London: T&T Clark, 2012) 69-109; Barclay, *Paul and the Gift*, 435-39.

authority to command Philemon (9) but he prefers to ground the appeal for Onesimus on the basis of love (10; cf. 19-20).²⁷ The terms Paul uses in dealing with issues of honor and status include συνίστημι, καύχημα, δόκιμος, and others.²⁸ Paul appeals to readers' sense of honor in dealing with specific issues in the community.²⁹ Paul present his credentials and accomplishments when the situation calls for it, but he prefers to "boast in" God and his communities, and he believes his communities should boast in him.³⁰ Romans 15 reveals Paul's preferred way of presenting his success, that is, outside the heat of polemics (17-18): "In Christ Jesus I have reason to boast in my work for God, but I would not dare to speak of anything except what Christ has accomplished through me" (cf. 1 Cor 3:7). Throughout the letters Paul conforms to the early Christian convention, in dealing with issues of honor and shame, of redirecting focus onto the opinion of God and to commendation from God at the eschaton.³¹

²⁷ John M. G. Barclay, "Paul, Philemon and Christian Slave-Ownership," *NTS* 1991 (37): 171-72; Wright, *Paul and the Faithfulness of God*, 5-6.

²⁸ With cognates, συνίστημι: 2 Cor 3:1, 4:2, 5:12, 6:4; Rom 16:1, commending Phoebe; καύχημα: 1 Thess 2:19; 1 Cor 3:21, 5:6, 15:31; 2 Cor 1:12, 14, 2:4, 5:6, 12, 7:9, 9:15-16, 10:13, 11:17-18; Rom 3:27, 15:17; Phil 1:26, 2:16; δόκιμος: 1 Thess 2:4; Gal 6:4; 2 Cor 10:18, 13:7; Rom 14:18; ἐγκρίνω and συγκρίνω: 2 Cor 10:12; αἰσχύνω: 1 Cor 1:27, 11:4, 6; 2 Cor 4:2, 10:8; Phil 1:20, 3:19; ἔπαινος: 1 Cor 4:5; 2 Cor 8:8; Rom 2:29, 13:3; Phil 4:8.

²⁹ 1 Cor 11:4-5, 14-15, 15:34.

³⁰ Boasting in the community: 1 Thess 2:19-20, 1 Cor 15:31; 2 Cor 7:9, 7:14, 8:24; Phil 2:16; Boasting in God: 1 Cor 1:31, citing Jer 9:24; Rom 5:11

³¹ Lendon, *Empire of Honor*, 92-95, 92 on the general convention: "The Christian does not properly seek glory in this life...In theory this Christian honour was conferred by God and was enjoyed in heaven." Chrysostom, *Homilies*, 244, 259. Vermeulen, *The semantic development of Gloria*, 28-133. DeSilva (*Despising Shame*, 120-23) refers to setting up an alternate "court of reputation" consisting of God and the assembly of people that affirm God's values. On commendation by God in Paul see 1 Thess 2:4, "We speak not to please mortals but to please God who tests our hearts (οὐχ ὡς ἀνθρώποις ἀρέσκοντες ἀλλὰ θεῷ τῷ δοκιμάζοντι τὰς καρδίας ἡμῶν)"; Gal 1:10; 1 Cor 4:3-5, "It is a small matter that I should be judged...by a human court...It is the Lord who judges me. Therefore do not pronounce judgment before the time, before the Lord comes...Then each one will receive commendation from God (ὁ ἔπαινος γενήσεται ἐκάστῳ ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ)"; 2 Cor 10:18; Rom 2:29, 14:18. 1 Cor 27:29: "God chose what is foolish in the world to shame the wise; God chose what is weak in the world to shame the strong...so that no one might boast in the presence of God."

2. Glory Passages

2.1 The Process of Transformation: 2 Cor 3:7-5:10; Phil 3:20-21; 1 Cor 15:43

The key texts that illuminate Paul's understanding of the nature and process of eschatological glorification, outside of Romans, are in 2 Corinthians 3-5, Philippians 3, and 1 Corinthians 15.³² No attempt is made here to treat the extent of problems associated with these passages. The focus remains on Paul's use of the language of glory. The first point to note is that in these texts Paul envisions a transformation. This is signaled repeatedly in connection with glory, as in the use of the verbs μεταμορφώω and μετασχηματίζω in 2 Cor 3:18 and Phil 3:21 and in 1 Cor 15:25-28 by the association of glory with a transformed σῶμα (15:41-43). This means that a definition of glorification in Paul must include the idea of a transformed condition and not only an honoring in God's sight.³³ Second, Paul consistently presents transformation into glory through the interface of divine presence, and this has, in Paul's view, both a present and an analogous future component (in line with the principle of the overlap of the ages): people are transformed into glory in the present, in the presence of the spirit, and in the future in the presence of God and Jesus. This interface with divine presence carries with it the association of purity, inasmuch as for Paul purity is requisite for enjoying divine presence.

These associations and dynamics appear in the principal texts highlighted in this section, starting with 2 Cor 2:14-3:18, 4:14, 17-18, and 5:1-10. 2 Corinthians 2:14-4:6 begins the section

³² On which see Renwick, *Paul, the Temple, and the Presence of God*, 47-156; Newman, *Paul's Glory-Christology*, 207-12, 227-35; Thrall, *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, I.282-400; Stephen E. Fowl, *Philippians* (The Two Horizons Testament Commentary; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005) 159-76; Van Kooten, *Paul's Anthropology in Context*, 335-39; Sprinkle, "The Afterlife in Romans," 216-18; Finney, *Honour and Conflict*, 212-16; Duff, *Moses in Corinth*, 172-209; Jacob, *Conformed to the Image*, 140-59, 165-69.

³³ Counter to the understanding of eschatological glorification in Moxnes ("Honour and Righteousness," 73). See Vermeulen, *Gloria in early Christian Latin*, 1-2, who notes that from an early stage Christian interpreters misunderstood glory in scripture by associating it exclusively with honor or renown rather than recognizing the biblical meaning of splendor.

of 2 Corinthians in which Paul defends his apostolic ministry (2:14-7:4). The language of glory appears 13 times in the section of 2:14-3:18. The use of language in LXX Exod 34:29-35, the story of Moses' shining face in the presence of God, stands behind the passage. Paul argues for the superiority of his ministry, the ministry of the "new covenant" (3:6), in relation to the ministry of Moses. Paul's ministry has "glory" in the same manner that Moses' ministry "came in glory"; that is, Paul's ministry, on analogy with Moses', is legitimated by the radiance and presence of God.³⁴ However, Paul states that the ministry of Moses is καταργούμενον (3:11), ceasing, and that the ministry of Moses was "of death," whereas Paul's ministry, the ministry of the spirit and righteousness (3:8, 9), the ministry of "surpassingly greater glory" (10), is permanent (11). Paul appeals in 3:14-18 to the presence of the spirit that his ministry offers (3:8) and states that the spirit is the means of freedom and transformation into glory (3:17-18).

The meaning of δόξα and δοξάζω in 2 Cor 3:7-13 must be explored. The reference to the ministry coming "with glory" in 3:7a refers to the presence of God and the radiance that stems from this that legitimized Moses' ministry. Glory in 3:7b refers to the radiance of Moses' face that came through being in God's presence (Exod 34:29-35). The ministry of the spirit, Paul's ministry, also (3:8) "will be in glory"; it "abounds...with glory" (9; also 11). That is, the ministry is accompanied by divine presence and radiance that stems from this.³⁵ In 3:10 the verbal form

³⁴ Newman, *Paul's Glory-Christology*, 232: "Paul recognizes that Moses' reception of the law was attended and thus legitimized by God's כבוד-δόξα... The Sinaitic revelation of כבוד to Moses and the Christophanic revelation of δόξα to Paul are thus comparable: in both cases the revelation of Glory serves to legitimize authority." Walter Brueggemann, "The Crisis and Promise of Presence in Israel," *Horizons in Biblical Theology* 1 (1980) 65.

³⁵ I disagree with Newman that with the language of glory in 3:8, 9, and 11 Paul refers to the Christophany that inaugurated his ministry (Newman, *Paul's Glory-Christology*, 233; see 1 Cor 9:1, 15:8, Gal 1:12). Paul nowhere associates his commissioning vision of Jesus with glory. Moreover, in 2 Corinthians 3 Paul does not ground the legitimacy of his ministry in a past experience of divine presence but in the current glory of his ministry (his ministry, present tense, "abounds...with glory [περισεύει...ἡ δόξη])."

occurs twice to mean “to make glorious,” “to make splendid,” in keeping with the use of the verb in OG Exod 34:29 and 30. Thus, Paul indicates that his ministry, on analogy with Moses’ ministry, has divine presence and the radiance that comes from this.

David Renwick argued convincingly that 2 Cor 2:14-3:18 is couched in terms of the need for purity, holiness, and righteousness for being in divine presence.³⁶ Renwick sees this dynamic in 2 Cor 2:17 with the reference to being in the presence of God. The text states, “As persons of purity (ἀλλ’ ὡς ἐξ εἰλικρινείας), as persons sent from God (ὡς ἐκ θεοῦ) and standing in God’s presence (κατέναντι θεοῦ), in Christ, we speak.” The rendering “persons of purity” rather than “persons of sincerity” for ἐξ εἰλικρινείας is due to the cultic resonance of the term elsewhere and specifically in Paul; the connection in the immediate context with κατέναντι θεοῦ, standing in God’s presence; and the cultic sense of the term in 2 Cor 1:12.³⁷ Thus, in 2 Cor 2:17, the logic is that Paul and his cohort have the purity necessary for standing in God’s presence, on analogy with the assumed purity of Moses in Exodus, and thus that they, like Moses, stand in God’s presence and speak on behalf of God.³⁸

Renwick also holds that Paul appeals to the purity necessary for divine presence in 2 Cor 3:18: “For we all, with unveiled faces, seeing the glory of the Lord as though reflected in a

³⁶ Renwick, *Paul, the Temple, and the Presence of God*, 61-74.

³⁷ 2 Cor 1:12 reads, “we have conducted ourselves with holiness and the purity of God (ἐν ἀγιότητι καὶ εἰλικρινείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ), not by fleshly wisdom but by the grace of God.” On ἀγιότης over ἀπλότης in 2 Cor 1:12, see Rudolf Bultmann, *The Second Letter to the Corinthians* (trans. Roy A. Harrisville; Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1985) 33; Margaret E. Thrall, “2 Corinthians 1:12: ΑΓΙΟΤΗΤΙ or ΑΠΛΟΤΗΤΙ?” in *Studies in New Testament Language and Text: Essays in Honour of G. D. Kilpatrick on the Occasion of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday* (NovTSup 44; ed. J. K. Elliott; Leiden: Brill, 1976) 372.

³⁸ Renwick, *Paul, the Temple, and the Presence of God*, 92, 94: “For Paul to declare that he too had been granted access to God’s presence...would be to declare...that he potentially stood where Moses’ stood...not as a “hawker” but as a legitimate heir of Moses...Paul’s ability to perform his role remains dependent on his ongoing access to God himself.” So, also, Carol K. Stockhausen, *Moses’ Veil and the Glory of the New Covenant: The Exegetical Substructure of II Cor. 3,1-4.6* (AnBib 116; Rome: Pontifical Institute, 1989) 82-86, on 2 Cor 3:1-6.

mirror...” Renwick here poses overlap between the language of purity and the language of righteousness, which Paul mentioned in 3:9: his ministry is the “ministry of righteousness (ἡ διακονία τῆς δικαιοσύνης).” Thus, Renwick writes, “The freedom from death and condemnation ...provided the necessary righteousness for those in Christ not only to approach God himself...but to be transformed by that presence for ever.”³⁹ This accords with the logic of the text introduced in Rom 2:17: Paul has the purity necessary for being in God’s presence, on analogy with Moses, and he says in 2 Cor 3:18 that “all of us,” a reference to all believers, may experience God’s presence on analogy with Moses, on account of Paul’s ministry.⁴⁰ The implied purity of Moses and the explicit purity of Paul suggest an accompanying purity of the people that now have access to God’s presence. The connection of this with righteousness, further, is plausible given the connection of righteousness/unrighteousness with purity elsewhere in Paul. Therefore, while the language of purity does not occur in 2 Cor 3:17-18, the idea of purity appears assumed in Paul’s references to “all of us” standing in God’s presence in 3:18.

2 Corinthians 3:18 illuminates Paul’s idea of transformation into glory. The verse reads, “And all of us, with unveiled faces, as we behold the glory of the Lord, are being transformed into the same image from glory to glory (μεταμορφούμεθα ἀπὸ δόξης εἰς δόξαν), as is from the Lord, the spirit.”⁴¹ The appositional reading is preferable for ἀπὸ κυρίου πνεύματος: Paul had referred to the presence of the spirit in 3:17; Paul identifies the spirit with the presence of God

³⁹ Ibid., 156.

⁴⁰ Thus, Scott Hafemann, *Paul, Moses, and the History of Israel: The Letter/Spirit Contrast and the Argument from Scripture in 2 Corinthians 3* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1995) 399: “Paul is...making it clear that Moses’ experience of YHWH in the tent of meeting is equivalent to the current *experience of the Spirit* in Paul’s ministry” (italics original).

⁴¹ I read ἀπὸ δόξης εἰς δόξαν not as referring to progressive stages of present glory but as source and result: the first, ἀπὸ δόξης, thus refers to the glory of the Lord, whereas εἰς δόξαν refers to the glory of the righteous. So, Chrysostom, *PG*. 61.488 (cited in Thrall, *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, 286); N. T. Wright, “Reflected Glory: 2 Corinthians 3,” in *The Climax of the Covenant* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991) 188.

throughout the letters; and there is an emphasis on divine presence through 3:7-18. The spirit thus makes the transformation into glory possible. Paul, further, indicates the dynamic of sight: the transformation happens “as we behold the glory of the Lord.”⁴² The closest intertextual connection remains Exodus 34, particularly, in this case, Exod 34:34-35; Moses “went in” to the presence of the Lord with an unveiled face and his face “was glorified” (δεδόξασται).” The same dynamic appears in 2 Cor 3:18: transformation happens in the presence of God.⁴³ In referring to the radiance Moses took on in divine presence, Paul joins with other early Jewish authors that referred to the splendor Moses took on.⁴⁴ However, unlike Exodus 34, Paul refers not only to the glorification of the face but to a transformation into glory, “into the same image.” This is not only an inward transformation: the language of glory and image express an external, visible likeness.⁴⁵ This appears to have a likeness to Jesus in view, in view of 2 Cor 4:11, “the life of Jesus may be made manifest in our bodies (ἐν τῷ σώματι ἡμῶν φανερωθῇ).”

The reference to εἰκών in 2 Cor 3:18 does not represent an allusion to Adam or Gen 1:26.⁴⁶ Certain interpreters have supposed this in view of the putative strong association of Adam with the language of both εἰκών and δόξα in Paul’s parlance and the reference to Christ as the “image of God” (εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ) in 2 Cor 4:4. However, in 2 Cor 3:18, the relevant intertextual

⁴² On instances of κατοπτρίζω that mean “to behold” without implying a mirror, see Bultmann, *Second Letter to the Corinthians*, 90-95. Also, on beholding rather than reflecting, Bultmann, 90-95; Jane M. F. Heath, *Paul’s Visual Piety: The Metamorphosis of the Beholder* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013) 218-22.

⁴³ This transformation is ongoing, as indicated by the present tense μεταμορφούμεθα.

⁴⁴ See Duff, *Moses in Corinth*, 147-50. Philo, *Moses* 2.70, “Those who saw him were filled with awe and amazement; nor even could their eyes continue to stand the dazzling brightness (φέγγους ἀπαστράπτοντος) that flashed from him like the rays of the sun.”

⁴⁵ Against Bultmann, *Second Letter to the Corinthians*, 96; Van Kooten, *Paul’s Anthropology in Context*, 325-38; with Thrall, *The Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, I.285.

⁴⁶ Against Jervell, *Imago Dei*, 174; Gordon E. Fee, *God’s Empowering Presence*, 318; Van Kooten, *Paul’s Anthropology in Context*, 338-39; Heath, *Paul’s Visual Piety*, 221-224; Jacob, *Conformed to the Image*, 165-67

figures remain Moses, Israel, and God; Adam and Eve are absent.⁴⁷ Adam and Eve are also absent from 2 Cor 4:4 and 6: Paul does not refer to an Adam-Christ dualism; such is entirely foreign to the context. Rather, the more generative context in which to understand Paul's reference to Christ as the "image of God" is the discourse of statues and pictures of the gods.⁴⁸ In this reading, the gospel of the "glory of Christ" is the gospel of the divine presence of Christ,⁴⁹ who Paul calls the image of God, that is, the visible representation of God among the people. There is no reason Paul would refer here to Christ as the "image of God" in terms of being made in the likeness of God's image, in the mode of Gen 1:26-27. The context of 2 Cor 4:1-6 is 2 Cor 2:14-3:18, which is concerned with divine presence: Paul stands in divine presence (2:14); Moses could stand in divine presence and he did so with unveiled face; and now all believers stand in divine presence (3:18); they have divine presence in the form of the spirit (3:17). And, divine presence remains a matter of interest in 2 Corinthians 4 (4:14, 17). So, Paul states in 2 Cor 4:4 that his gospel is "of the glory of Christ, who is the image of God," and by this he means that his gospel is of the presence of Christ, which is the visible representation of God among the people. By the gospel as of the presence of Christ, Paul appears to mean that his gospel mediates the presence of Christ: through it, people can enjoy divine presence, the spirit, which Paul in

⁴⁷ Thus, even Heath, *Paul's Visual Piety*, 223: "The allusion to Adam is muted at this stage in the epistle, since the narrative context is more focused on Sinai and on the Tabernacle, and the image contemplated is a glorious one." I would, of course, amend Heath to say that the allusion to Adam is entirely absent.

⁴⁸ Noted in Van Kooten, *Paul's Anthropology in Context*, 112-18, 199-206, though Van Kooten himself affirms an Adam-Christ dualism in 3:18-4:18 (338-39).

⁴⁹ So, Newman, *Paul's Glory-Christology*, 229-35, though Newman understands the glory in terms of theophany, while I understand the glory in terms of divine presence persistently accessible to those who believe.

Romans uses interchangeably with the “spirit of God,” “the spirit of Christ,” and just Christ (8:9-10).⁵⁰

This reading, further, squares with 2 Cor 4:6, “For it is the God who said, ‘Light will shine out of darkness,’ who shone in our hearts (ὃς ἔλαμψεν ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν) to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the presence of [Jesus] Christ (πρὸς φωτισμὸν τῆς γνώσεως τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν προσώπῳ [Ἰησοῦ] Χριστοῦ).” Paul places God in the heart; this is presumably a reference to the spirit (spirit in hearts in 2 Cor 1:22, 3:3; Gal 4:6; Rom 2:29, 5:5). At the same time, Paul places Christ among the people. The phrase ἐν προσώπῳ [Ἰησοῦ] Χριστοῦ has been understood to mean “in the face of Jesus Christ” in virtually all English translations.⁵¹ This is primarily because of the use of the term πρόσωπον in 2 Cor 3:7-18 (5x), where it means “face.”⁵² However, in other settings in Paul the term means “person,” “presence,”⁵³ including in the identical or (if Ἰησοῦ is original to 2 Cor 4:4) near identical phrase of 2 Cor 2:10: “What I have forgiven, if I have forgiven anything, has been for your sake in the presence of Christ (ἐν προσώπῳ Χριστοῦ).” Moreover, the reference to the presence of Christ, rather than simply to Christ’s face, accords with the emphasis on divine presence in the context and specifically Christ’s presence in 2 Cor 4:4. The meaning of 2 Cor 4:6, then, is that God has shined in the heart of the apostolic cohort so that they can offer knowledge of God’s glory (as presence and splendid likeness) through mediating Jesus’ presence. Paul here speaks specifically

⁵⁰ On which Mehrdad Fatehi, *The Spirit’s Relation to the Risen Lord in Paul* (WUNT 128; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000) 202, 229.

⁵¹ KJV, NRSV, NIV, NASB, CEB, JB, NET. I have not found an English bible translation that does not feature the translation “face.” Luther Bibel 2017: “...die Erleuchtung entstünde zur Erkenntnis der Herrlichkeit Gottes in dem Angesicht Jesu Christi.”

⁵² See also 1 Thess 3:10; Gal 1:26 (appearance), 2:11; 1 Cor 13:12 (“face to face”; implying presence), 14:25; 2 Cor 5:12, “in appearance.”

⁵³ 1 Thess 2:17; Gal 1:22; 2 Cor 8:23; cf. 2 Thess 1:9; Col 2:1; Acts 3:20, “from the presence of the Lord”, 5:40, 7:45; Rev 6:16. 2 Cor 1:11, “through [the prayers of] many people” (ἐκ πολλῶν προσώπων). See BDAG, s.v. πρόσωπον.

of what God has done for the apostles, but this does not mean that God will not also “shine in the hearts” of those in Paul’s communities. Rather, all believers have access to knowledge of God’s glory through Paul’s activity (3:17-18).⁵⁴

Turning back to consideration of transformation into glory in 2 Corinthians 3-4, we see, in 2 Cor 3:18, the transformation into glory, into the “same image,” that corresponds to the “glory of God,” which happens through the dynamics of presence and sight. The same dynamic appears in 2 Cor 4:17. I propose an association between 2 Cor 4:17 and 4:14 along the lines of glory and divine presence. 2 Corinthians 4:14 states, “We know that the one who raised the Lord Jesus will raise us also with Jesus and will bring [us] with you [into his presence] (καὶ παραστήσει σὺν ὑμῖν).” The verb *παρίστημι* means to “present” or “bring before”; here bringing before God is implied (so NRSV; BDAG). The association is explicit in 1 Cor 8:8: “Food will not bring us close to God (βρῶμα δὲ ἡμᾶς οὐ παραστήσει τῷ θεῷ).” The bringing before God in 2 Cor 4:14 means being brought into God’s presence as a form of eschatological blessing.⁵⁵ Paul refers to this again in 2 Cor 4:17, “For this slight momentary suffering is preparing for us an eternal weight of glory far beyond comparison (καθ’ ὑπερβολὴν εἰς ὑπερβολὴν αἰώνιον βάρος δόξης).” The “eternal weight of glory” is a superlative statement that, in association with 2 Cor 3:18 and 4:14, refers both to being in the presence of God’s glory and the accompanying glory of the righteous. The rationale of 2 Cor 3:18 is present in 4:17: Paul envisions resurrection and then

⁵⁴ For Christ’s presence in Paul see, further, 2 Cor 13:5, “Do you not realize that that Jesus Christ is in you?”; Gal 2:20, “It is no longer I who live, but Christ who lives in me”; cf. Col 1:27, “the riches of the glory of this mystery, which is Christ in you, the hope of glory.” Cited in Markus Bockmuehl, “The personal presence of Jesus in the writings of Paul,” *SJT* 70 (2017): 46.

⁵⁵ So, BDAG, s.v. *παρίστημι*; Thrall, *The Second Letter to the Corinthians*, I.343-44. Cf. Eph 5:26-27, “present the church to himself in glory (παραστήσει αὐτὸς ἑαυτῷ ἑνδοξον).” Not a forensic meaning, as both BDAG and Thrall recognize. Cf. Rom 14:10, “For we will all be presented before the seat of Christ (παραστησόμεθα τῷ βήματι τοῦ θεοῦ)”; here a forensic meaning is explicit with the reference to τῷ βήματι τοῦ θεοῦ.

presentation before God's glory (4:14). Due to being "brought into the presence" of God, the righteous take on a glorious form. In this verse, then, the "eternal weight of glory" refers to the presence of God and the transformation into glory awaiting believers following suffering. Further, that this dynamic of transformation in divine presence is at play in 2 Cor 4:17 is confirmed by the reference to the spirit as an ὁραβών in 2 Cor 5:5. The spirit provides a "first installment" of taking on a new dwelling in 2 Cor 5:1-5. The meaning is that the transformation in divine presence happening now, through the spirit, conforms to and is a guarantee of the transformation to happen in divine presence at the eschaton.⁵⁶

Thus, we see that, in 2 Cor 3:18, 4:14, and 4:17, Paul envisions the righteous being in divine presence and taking on glory in divine presence. A transformation into glory occurs through the interface of divine presence and sight. This transformation happens, in the present, through the spirit, and in the future in the presence of God and Jesus. There is, moreover, a conceptual association with purity. For Paul, purity is necessary for enjoying the spirit and for enjoying future divine presence. Paul refers to purity explicitly in 2 Cor 2:17 with the reference to εὐκρίνεια, and Paul assumes the purity of believers in referring to access to the glory of God in 2 Cor 3:18 and chapter 4.

The presentation of transformation into glory in 2 Corinthians 3-5 aligns with what appears in Phil 3:20-21 and 1 Cor 15:35-58. In Philippians 3 Paul refers to future glory while contrasting "enemies of the cross of Christ" with those whose "citizenship is in the heavens." Paul states that (3:21) "from there we are expecting a Savior, the Lord Jesus Christ, who will

⁵⁶ Paul wishes to be "further clothed" (ἐπενδύσασθαι). For clothing and the eschatological form, see 1 Cor 15:53-54; Gal 3:26-27, "put on Christ"; cf. Rom 13:12-14, "Put on the armor of light...put on the Lord Jesus Christ"; Col 3:9-10; cited in Constantine R. Campbell, "Metaphor, Reality, and Union with Christ," in *"In Christ" in Paul: Explorations in Paul's Theology of Union and Participation* (ed. Michael J. Thate et al.; WUNT II/384; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014) 75. On the spirit as ὁραβών, see Fee, *God's Empowering Presence*, 806-07.

change the form of the body of our humility (ὃς μετασχηματίσει τὸ σῶμα τῆς ταπεινώσεως ἡμῶν) to be conformed to the body of his glory (σύμμορφον τῷ σώματι τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ).” Here again the transformation into a glorious form happens in divine presence: Jesus comes, at which time the people take on a form that corresponds to Jesus’ form. In Phil 3:21 δόξα denotes the radiance and honor that characterizes Jesus’ eschatological form.⁵⁷ The dynamic of transformation into glory in divine presence appears also in 1 Cor 15:35-58. The section deals with the nature of the resurrection σῶμα, which links Phil 3:21 and the 1 Corinthians 15 text. Paul states that bodies are (15:43) “sown in dishonor, raised in glory (σπείρεται ἐν ἀτιμίᾳ, ἐγείρεται ἐν δόξῃ).” Again, δόξα is coupled with an honor term, ἀτιμία, and again Paul envisions transformation to occur in Jesus’ presence: the “change” happens when Jesus comes (15:23, 51-52). As in Phil 3:21, the δόξα of 15:43 is the radiant and honorable form into which the body will be transformed.⁵⁸

In 1 Corinthians 15 the transformation into glory and resurrection have roughly the same temporal referent, that is, they happen when Jesus comes. However, Paul never conflates the language of glorification and resurrection. Paul does not say, “sown in dishonor, glorified,” but “sown in dishonor, raised (the term for resurrection) in glory.” Paul never uses the term δοξάζω to mean “to raise,” “to exalt (through resurrection).” This is important to note because, though for Paul resurrection and glorification happen at roughly the same time, the language of glory and the language of resurrection have their own meanings and linguistic and conceptual

⁵⁷ It would be reductive to limit the meaning of δόξα in Phil 3:21 only to “honor,” in view of the parallel with ταπείνωσις. Paul shows the association of radiance with δόξα in 2 Corinthians 3-4 and 1 Cor 15:40-43, and the radiance of Jesus’ eschatological body was an interpretive trope in early Christian sources (Acts 22:11; Mark 9:3; Matt 17:2; Luke 9:32; 2 Pet 2:17; Heb 1:3).

⁵⁸ See association of glory with stars in 1 Cor 15:40-41 (5x).

associations. As discussed here, glory is associated with honor, radiance, sight, and divine presence.

Certain interpreters have sought to find a connection to Adam and the use of the language of glory in OG Ps 8:6 behind Paul's references to glory in Phil 3:21 and 1 Cor 15:49.⁵⁹ However, this theory is tenuous given that Paul does not associate glory with Psalm or Adam in either context. There is a likely allusion to OG Ps 8:7 in 1 Cor 15:27 with the statement, "He set all things under his feet (πάντα γὰρ ὑπέταξεν ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ)."⁶⁰ However, Paul nowhere cites OG Ps 8:6, "you crowned him with glory and honor," and the first mention of glory in 1 Corinthians 15 is 15:40, by which time Psalm 8 is no longer in view. The supposition of OG Ps 8:6 behind Phil 3:21 is equally as unlikely. Further, Paul does not associate glory with Adam in Phil 3:20-21 and 1 Corinthians 15. Adam is not in view at all in Philippians 3. In 1 Corinthians 15, Paul refers to Adam in opposition to Christ (15:21, 22, 45-49), but Adam is on the side of the equation not with "glory" but with the "perishable, the "earthly," the "dishonor," and so on. Moreover, it is not clear that Gen 1:26 is behind 1 Cor 15:49: the contrast is not with the image of God or lack of this, in fact, the "image of God" is not in view at all. Paul refers to the image of the "earthly" and the "heavenly." So, the theory that Adam or OG Ps 8:6 is relevant for understanding glory in Phil 3:20-21 and 1 Cor 15:43 is not supported by the evidence.

2.2 Eschatological Glory: 1 Thess 2:12; 1 Cor 2:7-8; Phil 4:19

We see from the above contexts, then, that Paul consistently refers to a transformation into glory through the medium of divine presence. In the present, transformation into glory

⁵⁹ Dunn, *Christology in the Making*, 108-13; Wright, *Paul and the Faithfulness of God*, 639-41, 733-37, 1064; Jacob, *Conformed to the Image*, 140-59, 191, 259-60.

⁶⁰ OG Ps 8:7: "You placed all things under his feet (πάντα ὑπέταξας ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ)."

happens through the spirit (3:18), and in the future this happens through the presence of God and Jesus (2 Cor 4:14, 17, Phil 3:21, 1 Cor 15:43).⁶¹ The glory the righteous take on is radiance and honor that corresponds to Christ's form. Purity is connected to this insofar as for Paul purity is necessary for enjoying divine presence. There are, further, other texts that refer to eschatological glory that conform to the texts noted above. In 1 Thess 2:12 Paul refers to God as the one who "calls you into his own kingdom and glory (καλοῦντος ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ βασιλείαν καὶ δόξαν)." Previous interpretation has understood this in terms of the glory the righteous take on,⁶² but the use of the preposition εἰς, which in Paul's idiom can have the sense of movement into a sphere or location (Rom 15:25; 2 Cor 1:16, 23), and the designation of the glory as God's own glory, points in favor of understanding this as a reference to God's presence. Thus, the sense is that God calls readers into his kingdom and presence, and they must act in conformity to this. The reference to "walking worthy" (τὸ περιπατεῖν ὑμᾶς ἀξίως) parallels the references in 1 Thessalonians to the purity necessary for divine presence (1:10-11, 3:13, 4:7-8). 1 Corinthians 2:7 refers to God's plan decreed "for our glory," a reference to eschatological transformation into glory, which in the context is explicitly Christological: Paul calls Jesus the "Lord of Glory" (2:8). In Phil 4:19, Paul refers to glory amid referring to God's providing for the Philippians' needs: "My God will fully supply every need of yours according to his riches in glory in Christ Jesus." The phrase ἐν δόξῃ refers to the realm of divine presence from which God supplies

⁶¹ On the enjoyment of both God and Jesus at the eschaton, see, again, 1 Thess 3:13, "That you may be blameless in holiness before our God and father at the coming of our Lord Jesus with the holy angels."

⁶² Ernst von Dobschütz, *Die Thessalonischer-Briefe* (7th ed.; KEK; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1909) 102; Raymond F. Collins, *Studies on the First Letter to the Thessalonians* (BETL 66; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1984) 238. Newman, *Paul's Glory-Christology*, 224, "the in-breaking of the future (resurrection) age."

needs, which are accessible to people “in Christ.”⁶³ The dynamic of divine patronage is active: God supplies needs, and because of this God is due glory, which Paul refers to with the doxology (4:20): “To our God and father be glory forever and ever (τῷ δὲ θεῷ καὶ πατρὶ ἡμῶν ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων). Amen.”

2.3 Glory to God

Philippians 4:20 is one of many examples where Paul refers to glory as praise to God on account of benefits. The connection appears in 2 Cor 4:15 where Paul characterizes gaining glory for God as a central motivation of his ministry: “All things are for you, so that grace, as it extends to more people (ἡ χάρις πλεονάσασα διὰ τῶν πλειόνων), may increase thanksgiving, to the glory of God (τὴν εὐχαριστίαν περισσεύσῃ εἰς τὴν δόξαν τοῦ θεοῦ).” Here God’s benefaction, χάρις, spreads through Paul’s ministry, which leads to thanksgiving from people as they become adherents to God, and this is for the δόξα, honor or praise, of God.⁶⁴ Grace is the catalyst for the return. Another setting which indicates the conceptual link of δόξα as praise to God with patronage is 2 Corinthians 8-9, the appeal for the collection. The language of χάρις appears throughout (8:1, 3, 6, 7, 9, 16, 19; 9:8, 14 [2x]). Paul wishes the Corinthians to offer a return, in the form of support for the collection, on account of God’s benefaction. Paul refers to generosity which will lead to εὐχαριστία (8:11, 12) and states that the collection is (8:19) “for the glory of the Lord” (πρὸς τὴν τοῦ κυρίου δόξαν) and that by supporting the collection the people

⁶³ So, Markus Bockmuehl, *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Philippians* (BNTC; London: A. & C. Black, 1997) 267.

⁶⁴ Paul’s use of glory as praise to God has been subject to misunderstanding. See Peter T. O’Brien, *Introductory Thanksgivings in the Letters of Paul* (Leiden; E. J. Brill, 1977) 182-83, who held that glory to God and Jesus means “showing forth” God “as he really is.” Donald Berry wrote (*Glory in Romans*, 15), “To ‘glorify’ God is to respond appropriately to his nature and character—his δόξα.” Rather, for Paul, to glorify God is to respond appropriately to his χάρις.

(9:13) “glorify God” (δοξάζοντες τὸν θεόν).⁶⁵ Thus, in these texts, Paul’s connection of glory as praise to God with the conceptual framework of divine patronage is clear.

Paul uses εἰς τὴν δόξαν τοῦ θεοῦ in 2 Cor 4:15 and throughout the letters (1 Cor 10:31; Phil 1:11, 2:11; Rom 15:7), where glory carries the sense honor or praise as a noun of action with the objective genitive θεός. Paul presents God’s gaining glory through the mediums of obedience and confession. In 1 Cor 6:20, Paul states that people glorify God by following Paul’s directives concerning sex, and in 2 Cor 8:13 the Corinthians glorify God through submission to the gospel (δοξάζοντες τὸν θεόν ἐπὶ τῇ ὑποταγῇ), that is, through donating to the collection.⁶⁶ Paul presents God gaining glory through confession in Phil 2:11, where the end-time declaration of Jesus as Lord is “for the glory of God.” Also, in 2 Cor 1:20, Paul indicates that he interpreted the liturgical practice of saying “Amen” (also mentioned in 1 Cor 14:16) as attributing glory to God. The liturgical practice of attributing glory to God on account of grace is reflected in Paul’s doxological formulas (Gal 1:5; Phil 4:20; Rom 11:36, 16:27).

2.4 Glory as Esteem among People

Elsewhere Paul uses the language of glory in connection to the honor and reputation of people within the community. In these contexts Paul shows the emphasis on the opinion of God,

⁶⁵ See also 8:23, the brothers are the δόξα Χριστοῦ, as increasing Christ’s fame; potentially, instead, as representatives of Christ’s presence. On which James R. Harrison, “The Brothers as the ‘Glory of Christ’ (2 Cor 8:23): Paul’s *Doxa* Terminology in Its Ancient Benefaction Context,” *NovT* 52 (2010): 156-88; Thomas D. Stegman, *Second Corinthians* (Catholic Commentary on Sacred Scripture; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2009) 204-06. The reference to δόξα Χριστοῦ as “source of honor” for Christ would parallel 1 Cor 11:7, where δόξα θεοῦ means source of honor for God and δόξα ἀνδρός means source of honor for man. This also parallels 1 Thess 2:20, “You are our glory and joy (ἡ δόξα ἡμῶν καὶ ἡ χαρά)!” which means that the Thessalonians are a source of honor and joy for Paul. Thus, I favor reading δόξα Χριστοῦ as referring to the brothers as a source of honor, praise, for Christ.

⁶⁶ 1 Cor 10:31; Gal 1:24, where Paul says his obedience led others to glorify God (cf. Matt 5:16, “They will see your good deeds and glorify your father in heaven (ἴδωσιν ὑμῶν τὰ καλὰ ἔργα καὶ δοξάσωσιν τὸν πατέρα ὑμῶν τὸν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς).”

as in 1 Thess 2:6, where Paul denies interest in glory from people: “Nor did we seek praise from people (οὔτε ζητοῦντες ἐξ ἀνθρώπων δόξαν), whether from you or others.” Paul seeks to please God (2:4), who “tests our hearts” (ἀρέσκοντες ἀλλὰ θεῷ τῷ δοκιμάζοντι τὰς καρδίας ἡμῶν).⁶⁷ Paul is attuned to the dynamics of honor in the early chapters of 1 Corinthians. He states that his readers are wise, strong, and (4:10) “held in honor” (ἐνδοξος), while Paul himself is weak and held in dishonor (ἄτιμος).⁶⁸ In 2 Cor 6:8, likewise, Paul refers to seasons of his life of good and bad reputation (διὰ δόξης καὶ ἀτιμίας διὰ δυσφημίας καὶ εὐφημίας). Paul employs the conventions of honor and shame in dealing with the issue of spiritual gifts in 1 Corinthians 12 and uses the language of glory within this (12:26). Paul expresses an ethic of honor that grants greater prestige to those not commonly considered the most honorable (23); “Those members of the body we think less honorable we clothe with greater honor (ἃ δοκοῦμεν ἀτιμότερα εἶναι τοῦ σώματος τούτοις τιμὴν περισσοτέραν περιτίθεμεν).” Moreover, Paul enumerates the idea of solidarity in the experience of honor and suffering: “If one member suffers, all suffer together with it; if one member is honored, all rejoice together with it (εἴτε δοξάζεται μέλος συγχαίρει πάντα τὰ μέλη).”⁶⁹

⁶⁷ On which see Abraham J. Malherbe, “Gentile as a Nurse: The Cynic Background of I Thess ii,” *NovT* 12 (1970): 214-17.

⁶⁸ Finney, *Honor and Conflict in the Ancient World*, 69-109, examines 1 Corinthians 1-4 in view of the dynamics of honor. His claim about ἐνδοξος is unusual: “The adjective ἐνδοξος (‘glorious’) in 1 Cor. 4.10 looks back to the OT concept that glory is revealed in the mighty acts of God.” The statement of 1 Cor 4:10 is, “We are fools for the sake of Christ, but you are wise in Christ. We are weak, but you are strong. You are held in honor, but we in dishonor (ὁμεῖς ἐνδοξοί, ἡμεῖς δὲ ἄτιμοι).” That somehow ἐνδοξος in 4:10 “looks back to the OT concept that glory is revealed in the mighty acts of God” illustrates the kinds of strange things interpreters will claim about the language of glory.

⁶⁹ On the ethic of honor in Paul, see, further, Barclay, *Paul and the Gift*, 435-49; Hellerman, *Reconstructing Honor in Roman Philippi*, 163-66. Paul refers to a wrong occasion for glory in Phil 3:19, “Their glory [is] in their shame (ἡ δόξα ἐν τῇ αἰσχύνῃ αὐτῶν).” This means that the “enemies of the cross of Christ” count as honorable things that are in fact shameful (cf. Fowl, *Philippians*, 171-72).

Paul appeals to ideas of honor and shame, further, in 1 Cor 11:2-16, the discussion of women's head coverings at community gatherings.⁷⁰ In 11:4-5 Paul refers to men disgracing their head (καταισχύνει τὴν κεφαλὴν), Jesus, through wearing something on their heads while praying or prophesying, and refers to women disgracing their head, their husbands, through praying or prophesying with heads uncovered. Paul appeals to readers' sense of shame and honor again in 1 Cor 11:14-15: Paul refers to what is natural and states that for a man to have long hair is a "shame to him" while for woman to have long hair it is "glory to her" (δόξα αὐτῇ ἐστίν). This context of honor and shame appears determinative for Paul's references to glory in 1 Cor 11:7: "A man ought not to have his head veiled, since he is the image and glory of God (εἰκὼν καὶ δόξα θεοῦ ὑπάρχων); but woman is the glory of man (δόξα ἀνδρός ἐστίν)."⁷¹ The reference to "image of God" appears to allude to Gen 1:26-27, but glory does not appear in that context. By reference to man being the glory of God, Paul appears to mean that man is ideally meant to be a source of honor for God, and woman is supposed to be a source of honor for man.⁷² The expression then parallels 1 Thess 2:20, where Paul states, "you are our glory and joy (γάρ ἐστε ἡ δόξα ἡμῶν καὶ ἡ χαρά)," meaning that the Thessalonians are a source of honor and joy for Paul and his cohort. That Paul refers to man as a source of honor for God, and woman as a source of honor for man, deepens the significance of 1 Cor 11:4-5: for women to shame their husbands

⁷⁰ On which see Sanders, *Paul*; Craig Keener, *1-2 Corinthians* (NCBC; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).

⁷¹ The NRSV reading, "reflection," ("Abglanz," Hans Lietzmann, *An die Korinther I/II* [HNT 9; 5th ed.; rev. W. G. Kümmel; Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1969] 52; Jervell, *Imago Dei*, 297) does not align with the use of glory in the immediate context and is moreover an unattested sense of the language in both the broader context and in Paul.

⁷² So, Gordon D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987) 515-18; Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 32; New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008) 415; Keener, *1-2 Corinthians*, 93.

through not wearing head coverings is to act counter to the purpose for which women were made. Thus, glory means “source of honor” in 1 Cor 11:7.

Here in 1 Cor 11:7 Paul associates the language of glory and image, together, with Genesis and Adam. However, the meaning of glory and the use of Genesis in this text does not square with other second Temple texts that refer to the glory of Adam.⁷³ In 1 Corinthians man is the glory of God as a source of honor, whereas Adam’s lost glory is a garment of radiance.⁷⁴ Moreover, the text does not parallel in its particulars the reference to Adam’s glory in the DSS: there, Adam’s glory is an eschatological reward, while in 1 Corinthians Paul refers to man as currently meant to be a source of honor. The appropriate framework for understanding glory in 1 Cor 11:7 is not a trope related to Genesis but rather the dynamics of honor and shame. Therefore 1 Cor 11:7 should not be cited in support of the idea of Adam’s loss of primeval glory or with reference to the human loss or future enjoyment of glory.

3. Conclusion

We have thus surveyed the language of glory in the Letters of Paul excluding the Letter to the Romans. We saw the meaning of the language of glory in Paul’s usage and the conceptual associations of the language. For Paul, the experience of eschatological glory consists of divine presence and transformation in divine presence. This transformation involves a change into a radiant, honorable form. There is in 2 Corinthians 2-4 a connection of glory with purity: Paul appeals to the purity necessary for enjoying divine presence. Paul elsewhere shows the connection of purity with divine presence (1 Cor 6:19; 2 Cor 6:14-7:1). Paul also uses the

⁷³ Recognized in Jervell, *Imago Dei*, 312: “1 Kor 11,2—12 steht vereinzelt in der paulinischen Überlieferung und läßt sich mit den anderen Auslegungen von Gen 1,27 nicht vereinbaren.”

⁷⁴ See chapter 2 section 2.2.

language of glory attributed to God to refer to praise in return for grace from God. Gaining glory for God is a central impetus of Paul's missionary activity (2 Cor 4:15). Further, Paul uses the language of glory in connection to esteem among people. With the language of glory, Paul refers to seasons of good and bad reputation and appeals to readers sense of honor and shame to undergird directives (1 Cor 11:2-16; 1 Corinthians 12).

With this conceptual and semantic profile of glory in Paul's usage in view, we may turn to the use of the language in the Letter to the Romans. In the next chapter we examine the language of glory in Romans 1-5. Our account will highlight the dynamics of purity and divine presence appearing alongside the other issues within these chapters. Paul refers to impurity caused by sin and the loss of divine presence that results from this. Jesus, as a "place of atonement," is the means of addressing the impurity and loss of divine presence. The presence of the spirit is the reversal, in the present, of the situation set up in Romans 1. In Romans 5 Paul envisions the future, full experience of divine presence at the eschaton.

4. Glory in Romans 1-5

We have seen that in Paul's parlance the language of glory is associated, in contexts of praise, to the concept of divine patronage; in contexts of esteem towards humans, to honor; and, in contexts of eschatology and salvation, to divine presence, transformation, and purity. In this chapter, we consider the language of glory in Romans 1-5. The language appears eight times in these chapters: 1:21, 23, 2:7, 10, 3:7, 3:23, 4:20, and 5:2. I argue that Rom 1:18-32 is an instance of purity discourse in which Paul presents the general human condition in terms of impurity, the wrath of God, and the loss of divine presence that results from this. Romans 3:21-26 and 5:1-11, where Paul again refers to the "glory of God," likewise employs the logic of purity discourse. In Rom 1:23, 3:23, and 5:2, the glory of God is the presence of God. In Rom 1:18-32, humans lose the presence of God. Paul refers to this loss of divine presence on account of impurity again in 3:23. In Rom 5:2 Paul refers to future divine presence in terms of the glory of God, and he appeals to the spirit in hearts as a present form and guarantee of future divine presence. Jesus within the discussion functions as a "place of atonement" (3:25) that cleanses the people of impurity, addresses the wrath of God, and makes it possible for those who believe to enjoy divine presence. With the language of glory, Paul talks about salvation and eschatology and also talks about praise to God on account of benefits. Throughout the discussion I emphasize the importance of divine presence in the logic of Romans. Divine presence is a central motif in the letter, and the language of glory plays an important role in this motif. For Paul in Romans, divine presence is necessary for virtue. Jesus' blood makes divine presence possible, and the spirit is the present form of divine presence that allows for a virtuous life in advance of future eschatological life.

1. Glory in Rom 1:18-32: Primeval People Worship Idols; God Leaves People to Impurity

1.1 Preliminary Issues

The first text to discuss is Rom 1:18-32. In setting up the analysis of this passage, certain preliminary issues must be addressed. The first issue concerns the identification of the people Paul has in view. This issue has drawn the attention of interpreters for a long time, but it recently became more significant given the current emphasis on the gentile orientation of Paul's ministry and gospel.¹ The major options are that Paul refers in Rom 1:18-32 only to gentiles or that Paul refers to all people without ethnic distinction. Interpreters are split on the question.² The gentile-only reading stems from the idea that Paul would not charge Jews with the kinds of activities that appear in Rom 1:18-32. Further, the passage is thought to parallel Wisdom of Solomon 13-15, which is an anti-idolatry polemic against gentiles. My position is that the referent of Paul's charge in Rom 1:18-32 is all humanity, a group not divided along ethnic lines. Research has already shown that the connection with Wisdom of Solomon 13-15 cannot determine the makeup

¹ Lloyd Gaston, *Paul and the Torah* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1987); Stowers, *Rereading of Romans*; Mark D. Nanos, *The Mystery of Romans: the Jewish Context of Paul's Letter* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996); John G. Gager, *Reinventing Paul* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000); A. Andrew Das, *Solving the Romans Debate*; Rafael Rodríguez, *If You Call Yourself a Jew: Reappraising Paul's Letter to the Romans* (Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2014); Rafael Rodríguez and Matthew Thiessen, eds., *The So-Called Jew in Paul's Letter to the Romans* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2016); Fredriksen, *Paul*, 156, captures the sentiment: "Romans speaks most directly not to the justification of sinners in general, but to the justification specifically of gentiles-in-Christ."

² Gentiles only: Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, 39-41; Käsemann, *Romans*, 36, 52-53; Gaston, *Paul and the Torah*, 140; Moo, *Romans*, 92-93 ("humanity apart from special revelation"); Stowers, *Rereading of Romans*, 83-125; Lohse, *Römer*, 84-86; Dale Martin, *Sex and the Single Savior: Gender and Sexuality in Biblical Interpretation* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2006) 52-53; Matthew Thiessen, *Paul and the Gentile Problem* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016) 47-52; Fredriksen, *Paul*, 38, 125, 157. All people: John Calvin, *Romans*, xxx; Leenhardt, *Romans*, 59-60; Cranfield, *Romans*, 1.105; Bruce W. Longenecker, *Eschatology and the Covenant: A Comparison of 4 Ezra and Romans 1-11* (JSNTSup 57; Sheffield: JSOT, 1991) 173; Robert Jewett, *Romans*, 152; Jonathan A. Linebaugh, "Announcing the Human: Rethinking the Relationship between Wisdom of Solomon 13-15 and Rom 1:18-2:11," *NTS* 57 (2011): 214-37; Michael Wolter, *Römer*, 130-31, 137; Barclay, *Paul and the Gift*, 462-63; Longenecker, *Romans*, 196; Michael J. Gorman, *Apostle of the Crucified Lord: A Theological Introduction to Paul and His Letters* (2nd ed.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2017) 412-13.

of the group of people signaled in Rom 1:18 by the word ἄνθρωποι. This appears not least because Paul's rhetorical strategy in Romans 1-3 is directly antithetical to the sharp distinction between Jews and gentiles Wisdom sets up: Paul argues for no distinction between Jews and gentiles vis-à-vis unrighteousness and anthropology.³ But, further, the primeval historical referent that appears in the passage precedes the existence of Jews as a group distinct from the rest of humanity.⁴ To pose a separation between Jews and the people Paul has in view is to add a distinction that Paul, in Rom 1:18-32, does not make.⁵ In this analysis, then, I treat the condition Paul places humans in Romans 1 as applying to all people, regardless of their ethnicity.

A second preliminary issue is the question, whether in Rom 1:18-32 Paul alludes to Genesis 1-3 and Adam. Paul's interest in Adam, and particularly the supposed connection of Adam and glory, has been of interest at points throughout this analysis. The notion that Paul has Adam and Genesis in view in Rom 1:18-32 has a distinguished scholarly pedigree: Jacob Jervell and Morna Hooker formulated the view and it has since gained many adherents.⁶ There are both strong and attenuated versions of the theory. The strong version holds that Genesis 1-3 and

³ Bruce Longenecker, *Eschatology and the Covenant*, 173; Jonathan Linebaugh, "Announcing the Human," 214-37; Richard Longenecker, *Romans*, 196.

⁴ On the shift to a primeval historical referent, see Jewett, *Romans*, 156, and sources cited there.

⁵ Note summary of Martin, *Sex and the Single Savior*, 52-53: "Once upon a time, even after the sin of Adam, all humanity was safely and securely monotheistic. At some point in ancient history most of humanity rebelled against god." Paul does not pose a "most of humanity." There is no shift from "all humanity" to only gentiles in Rom 1:18-32. Wolter (*Römer*, 131) notes that Jews and gentiles together are the recipients of God's righteousness in Rom 1:16-17 and that there is no shift from an all-inclusive referent to only gentiles between Rom 1:16-17 and 18. "Das Begriffspaar »Jude und Grieche« (V. 16) wird durch »Menschen« (V. 18) wiederaufgenommen.

⁶ Hooker, "Adam in Romans 1," 297-306; Jervell, *Imago Dei*, 312-31; Wedderburn, "Adam in Paul's Letter to the Romans," 413-30; Dunn, *Romans 1-8*, 54-76; *Christology in the Making*, 101-02; "Adam and Christ," 127-29; Bruce Longenecker, *Eschatology and the Covenant*, 173; N. T. Wright, "The Letter to the Romans: Introduction, Commentary, and Reflections," in *The New Interpreter's Bible* (Nashville: Abingdon, 2002) 10.432-33; *Paul and the Faithfulness of God*, 769; Jewett, *Romans*, 182, 184, 186; Schwindt, *Gesichte der Herrlichkeit*, 92-105, 117-19, 138, 190; Byrskog, "Christology and Identity," 1-18; Gorman, "Romans: The First Christian Treatise on Theosis," 20, 22; Berry, *Glory in Romans*, 11-32; Jacob, *Conformed to the Image*, 85-92.

Adam are present, via allusion, throughout Rom 1:18-32, such that when Paul refers to the they, them, and their, Adam is in view.⁷ This reading appears *prima facie* incorrect given the amount of difference between Genesis 1-3 and Romans 1. Paul uses the plural noun ἄνθρωποι in Rom 1:18 and throughout the passage uses third person plural, rather than third person singular, pronouns. Further, Genesis 1-3 charges Adam and Eve with eating forbidden fruit, while in Romans 1 the transgressions are principally idolatry and sexual immorality. Still, given its influence in the history of interpretation, it is worth considering the points cited in the favor of the reading. Factors drawn from the immediate context are the reference to creation in Rom 1:20 and 25;⁸ the modification of OG Ps 105:20, thought to be cited in Rom 1:23, with language that appears in Gen 1:20-26;⁹ and the reference to εἰκών in connection with glory in Rom 1:23. On this last point, there is a widespread sentiment that in Paul's idiom there is a strong association of the words εἰκών and δόξα with Adam.¹⁰ Further, proponents appeal to the contextual material that refers to Adam's loss of divine glory, which is thought to parallel what Paul says in Rom 1:23 and elsewhere. The reference to the exchange of "the glory of the immortal God for images resembling mortal human beings" is thought to parallel and appropriate conventions appearing in *Apocalypse of Moses* and other texts.¹¹

⁷ Hooker refers to the people as "man" and "mankind" ("Adam in Romans 1," 302, 305), which is a translation of Hebrew אָדָם. See also Dunn, "Adam and Christ," 127: "That Paul speaks not of Paul but of human beings in general (Rom 1:18) is less important, since, as just noted, Adam can stand for humankind (*ha-adam*). The idea of Adam signaled by plural pronouns also stems from an appeal to Rom 5:12-21, where Adam has a representative function.

⁸ Jervell, *Imago Dei*, 314; Dunn, "Adam and Christ," 127.

⁹ Hooker, "Adam in Romans 1," 300; cf. Jervell, *Imago Dei*, 320; Jacob, *Conformed to the Image*, 91.

¹⁰ Jervell, *Imago Dei*, 320-321, 325; Hooker, "Adam in Romans 1," 304-05; Dunn, "Adam and Christ," 129-30; Donald Berry, *Glory in Romans*, 24-28; Jacob, *Conformed to the Image*,

¹¹ Discussed in chapter 2. See Jervell, *Imago Dei*, 113-14; Hooker, "Adam in Romans 1," 305; Blackwell, "Immortal Glory and the Problem of Death," 288-89; The texts are *Apoc. Mos.* 20:1-2, 21:6; *Tg. Ps.-J.* Gen 2:25, 3:7; *3 Bar.* (Greek) 4:16; *Gen. Rab.* 12:6 on 2:4; *Apoc. Sedr.* 6:5.

All of this is very tenuous reasoning. As even proponents of the theory recognize, the reference to creation in Rom 1:20 and 25 cannot alone indicate an allusion to Adam. This consideration must work in tandem with other factors. The proposed triangulation of OG Ps 105:20, Rom 1:23, and LXX Gen 1:20-26, further, does not carry argumentative weight. Paul does not explicitly cite OG Psalm 105:20, and, in addition, it is not necessary to explain the difference of vocabulary between Rom 1:23 and OG Psalm 105 by appealing to an intention to invoke Genesis. Others have noted a possible connection with OG Deut 4:15-18, but Paul may as well have been drawing from his own linguistic storehouse.¹² In addition, Paul does not show a strong association of the language of εἰκών and δόξα with Adam. Paul definitely alludes to Adam with the word εἰκών in 1 Cor 15:49 (“just as we bore the image of the earthly, we will also bear the image of the heavenly” [ἐφορέσαμεν τὴν εἰκόνα τοῦ χοϊκοῦ, φορέσομεν καὶ τὴν εἰκόνα τοῦ ἐπουρανίου]), and there is an oblique reference to Adam with the language of glory and image paired in 1 Cor 11:7 (“a man should not have his head covered, since he is the image and glory of God [εἰκὼν καὶ δόξα θεοῦ ὑπάρχων]). But Paul does not associate Adam with image and glory in any other setting in the letters. Adam is not in view in 2 Cor 4:4, and Paul does not refer either to glory or image in connection with Adam in Rom 5:12-21. If the statement of Rom 1:23 was closer to what Paul says in 1 Cor 11:7, there may be slight grounds to speculate about an allusion to Adam in Romans 1. But even proponents of the Adam theory recognize that the portrayal of man in 1 Cor 11:7 stands in contrasts to what appears in Rom 1:18-32.¹³

Concerning the contextual parallels, we surveyed these in chapters 2 and discussed them in relation to glory in Paul in chapter 3. Critics of the Adam reading have long noted the late date

¹² Leenhardt, *Romans*, 67; Wolter, *Römer*, 145.

¹³ Jervell, *Imago Dei*, 312.

of the parallels and their relative sparsity.¹⁴ Moreover, the texts do not define Adam's glory in a way that would then stand behind the supposed meaning of glory in Rom 1:18-32.¹⁵ Adam's lost glory, in these other texts, is a garment of radiance, while interpreters seek to find an association of Adam's lost glory with divine image (Gen 1:26-27) in Romans 1. The contextual parallels do not support this way of reading Romans 1. These considerations, then, undermine the strong version of the Adam theory.

A more attenuated version of the reading appears in the study of Samuel Byrskog, where Byrskog holds that Paul refers to Adam only with the reference to the exchange of God's glory in Rom 1:23.¹⁶ Byrskog cites in favor of this view *Apocalypse of Moses*, but whereas others have speculated that the ideas in *Apocalypse of Moses* were already fully-formed by the time Paul wrote Romans, Byrskog holds that an interpretive tradition related to Adam was in the process of forming and that Romans represents an early stage in the development of the tradition.¹⁷ In keeping with other proponents of the Adam theory, Byrskog locates in Romans a "narrative substructure" of Adam-Christology that appears in Rom 1:23, 3:23, 5:2, 5:12-21, 7:7-12 and 8:18-30.¹⁸ This narrative substructure, if it unfolds according to Byrskog's reading, places Romans on the "emerging trajectory" of an interpretive tradition related to Adam that culminates in the *Apocalypse of Moses* and related texts.

¹⁴ See chapter 2 section 2.2. Haacker, *Römer*, 97: "Das Problem dieser Auffassung ist, daß eine relative selten belegte frühjüdische Vorstellung, ohne explizit ausgesprochen zu sein, bei Paulus oder gar seinen römischen Lesern als bekannt vorausgesetzt wird." Stowers, *Rereading of Romans*, 86-88; Macaskill, *Union with Christ*, 139-41.

¹⁵ Noted in Jacob, *Conformed to the Image*, 99-101.

¹⁶ Byrskog, "Christology and Identity," 9.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 7-9

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 9-18. See also Wright, "Romans," 10.432-43, 470; Dunn, "Adam and Christ," 127-37; Berry, *Glory in Romans*, 4-5, 192-94; now Jacob, *Conformed to the Image*, 98-100, 258.

The idea of a “narrative substructure” of Adam is significant because it implicates four key passages in Romans in which the language of glory appears. The question, of course, is whether the texts conform to Byrskog’s argument. This analysis, in this chapter and the next, shows that Adam-Christology is not in view in Rom 1:23, 3:23, 5:2, or 8:18-30. To make an obvious linguistic point, the glory in Rom 1:23, 3:23, and 5:2 is not Adam’s glory but the glory of God. Further, while the Adam-Christ antithesis appears in Rom 5:12-21 and 1 Cor 15:42-58, the antithesis is not in view, either explicitly or through allusion, in any text in Romans that refers to glory; a point that our discussion will illustrate. Other dynamics are at play; centrally, as discussed here in relation to Romans 1-5, the dynamics of purity and divine presence.

1.2 Romans 1:18-32 as Purity Discourse

We have discussed the ethnic makeup of the people of Rom 1:18-32 and considered whether Adam is in view with what Paul says in the passage. A point of further interest is the question, what kind of discussion Romans 1:18-32 is. Past research indicates that the passage conforms in its broad features to ancient decline narratives.¹⁹ This is right. Yet beyond this it remains to consider more precisely the nature of what Paul presents in the passage.

Developments in the study of ancient purity discourse, and specifically purity discourse in early Judaism and Christianity, make it possible to detect the dynamics of purity in Rom 1:18-32. I examined these dynamics in relation to the discourse of cultic purity and divine presence in chapter 2 and considered the dynamics of purity and divine presence in Paul, and specifically in relation to glory, in chapter 3. Here I argue that Rom 1:18-32 is an instance of cultic purity discourse of the kind that appears elsewhere in ancient literature and specifically in early

¹⁹ On ancient decline narratives in general, see W. K. C. Guthrie, *In the Beginning*; Gordon Campbell, *Lucretius on Creation*, 8-18; on Romans 1, see Stowers, *Rereading of Romans*, 85.

Judaism. This means that Rom 1:18-32 plays by the rules of purity discourse and should be interpreted as such, and this implicates the language of glory. That Rom 1:18-32 is purity discourse has been noted in some form in other settings,²⁰ and here I provide a fuller argument for it in view of considerations in the immediate context, the insight of contextual material, and data from elsewhere in Romans and Paul's other letters.

The dynamics of purity in Rom 1:18-32 are signaled at the beginning of the discussion with the reference, in 1:18, to the wrath of God on account of impiety and injustice. The terms Paul uses for these, ἀσέβεια and ἀδικία, do not, as previously supposed, each refer to tables of the law or to sins against God and sins against humans, respectively.²¹ The term ἀσέβεια probably refers principally to the idolatry mentioned throughout the passage, and ἀδικία refers to any unjust behavior, including the infractions of God's will noted in 1:29-30.²² The key conceptual association of the language to highlight here is the connection of these terms, coupled with the reference to God's wrath, ὀργή, with impurity. The idea of ἀσέβεια and ἀδικία as defiling things that occasion divine wrath has already been explored in detail in relation to ancient Greek religion.²³ Through the assimilation of Greek language, Greek terms for purity

²⁰ Origen, *Romans*, Stowers (*Rereading of Romans*, 94; see also 97, 276) on Rom 1:18-32: "This supposed description of gentile life reflects an ethnic caricature...that draws on two major cultural codes, the ethic of self-mastery and a Jewish code of purity and pollution." Jonathan Klawans, *Impurity and Sin* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001) 151-54, citing Rom 1:21-25. Klawans rightly highlights Paul's emphasis on moral impurity. On which see chapter 3 section 1.4.

²¹ Tables of the law: Otto Michel, *An die Römer* (14th ed.; KEK; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1955) 98-99; Leenhardt, *Romans*, 61; Sins against God and sins against humans: Michael J. Gorman, *Inhabiting the Cruciform God: Kenosis, Justification, and Theosis in Paul's Narrative Soteriology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009) 50.

²² Cranfield, *Romans*, 1.112; Käsemann, *Romans*, 38.

²³ See Petrovic and Petrovic, *Inner Purity and Pollution in Greek Religion*; see conclusion, 263-98. An instructive example is SEG XLIII 710 (1st century CE; cited and translated, Petrovic and Petrovic, 286): "If you bring a pure mind, stranger, and if in your soul justice you have practised, come to this place of sanctity. But if you engage with the unjust (εἰ δ' ἀδίκων ψαύεις) and if your mind is not pure, off with you from the gods' ritual and sanctuary. The holy house has not love for those who are bad, it castigates them instead (ἀλλὰ κολάζει), but to those who are religiously correct, it bestows equal thanks."

entered Jewish theological parlance, and the deployment of Greek purity language in Jewish texts conforms in many broad respects to the way it appears in Greek literature. Thus, OG Jeremiah 2-3 coordinates the language of wrath, injustice, impiety, righteousness, and impurity.²⁴ Further, Jeremiah indicates the notion of sin leading to divine wrath and impurity, which results in potential divine absence.²⁵ The same linguistic and conceptual associations appear in Ezekiel and Josephus: injustice and lawlessness, ungodliness, divine wrath, impurity, and divine absence.²⁶ These associations appear, also, in Rom 1:18: the wrath of God is revealed on account of the ἀσέβεια and ἀδικία and the impurity, implied in Rom 1:18, that this creates. The connection of impurity with Rom 1:18 is further signaled by the explicit reference to impurity (ἀκαθαρσία) in Rom 1:24.

²⁴ OG Jer 2:22-23, 3:2, 11-13: Though you wash yourself with nitre and multiply herbs for yourself, you have become stained by your injustices before me (κεκληλίδωσαι ἐν ταῖς ἀδικίαις σου ἐναντίον ἐμοῦ), says the Lord. How will you say, ‘I was not defiled (οὐκ ἐμίανθην), I did not go after the goddess Baal?’...And the Lord said to me: Israel has justified his soul in view of faithless Judah (ἐδικαίωσεν τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ Ἰσραὴλ)...Return to me, settlement of Israel, says the Lord, and I will not set my face against you...and I will not be wrathful against you forever (οὐ μηνιῶ ὑμῖν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα). Only acknowledge your injustice (ἀδικίαν σου), that you acted impiously against the Lord your God (εἰς κύριον τὸν θεόν σου ἡσέβησας).

²⁵ See Jer 7:3-4 (NRSV): “Amend your ways and your doings, and let me dwell with you in this place. Do not trust in these deceptive words: ‘This is the temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord’” (cf. 7:13-15; 26:1-24). On the rendering of the MT and the dynamics of divine presence in the temple sermon see Jonathan D. Bentall, “Jeremiah’s Temple Sermon and the Hermeneutics of Tradition: A Theological Reading of Jeremiah 7:1-15 and 26:1-24” (Ph.D. diss., Durham University, 2017).

²⁶ OG Ezekiel 9:8-10, “The unrighteousness of the house of Israel and Judah has become very, very great (ἀδικία τοῦ οἴκου Ἰσραὴλ καὶ Ἰουδα μεμεγάλυνται σφόδρα σφόδρα), because the land was filled with many people and the city was filled with unrighteousness and uncleanness (ἡ πόλις ἐπλήσθη ἀδικίας καὶ ἀκαθαρσίας)...[God speaking] And my eye will not spare, nor will I show pity.” In Ezekiel 10 Ezekiel watches as, due to impurity and wrath, the glory of God departs. Josephus, *A.J.* 20.164-66, “Even God himself, for loathing of their impiety (μισήσαντα τὴν ἀσέβειαν αὐτῶν), turned away from our city and, because he deemed the temple to be no longer a clean dwelling place for him (τὸ δὲ ἱερὸν οὐκέτι καθαρὸν οἰκητήριον αὐτῷ), brought the Romans upon us and purification by fire upon the city (τῇ πόλει καθάρσιον πῦρ).” *J.W.* 5.411-12: [They] were guilty, I imagine, of no such rank impiety as yours (οὐδὲν οἶμαι τῶν τότε ἡσεβηκότων τηλικούτων ἡλίκα ὑμεῖς). My belief, therefore, is that the deity has fled from the holy places and taken his stand on the side of those with whom you are now at war.”

Another indication of the purity dynamics of Rom 1:18-32 are the specific transgressions Paul highlights in the passage, namely idolatry and sexual immorality. These sins, in addition to murder (cf. Rom 1:29, φόνος) were the central cause of moral impurity in the priestly literature and later Jewish texts.²⁷ Impurity occasioned God's wrath and, if left unaddressed, would lead to God's departure.²⁸ Sexual immorality was strongly associated with impurity in early Christian literature and specifically Paul.²⁹ Thus, the emphasis on the polluting force of idolatry and sexual immorality in the broader context and Paul suggest that Paul highlighted these issues specifically, in Rom 1:18-32, because of their defiling force. A further indication of Romans 1 as purity discourse is the reference to the dysfunction to which impurity leads. Paul refers to "darkened minds," subject to passions, and degraded bodies in Rom 1:24, 26, and 28. Greek purity texts refer to defilement that pollutes the inner person and causes madness and inward dysfunction.³⁰ Likewise, in early Jewish and Christian literature impurity was often associated with demons and spirits that could cause madness or mental illness.³¹ The notion of the influence of impurity and demons accords with the presentation of the devolvment into injustice and wickedness in Rom 1:24-32.

A further point suggesting the purity dynamic is the association of Rom 1:18-32 with the righteousness of God in Rom 1:16-17. One might count this as a strike against the purity reading

²⁷ Klawans, *Impurity and Sin*, 21-42; *Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple*, 56.

²⁸ Chapter 2 section 2.3. Milgrom *Studies in Cultic Theology*, 81-82; Klawans, *Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple*, 68, 118-35.

²⁹ Blidstein, *Purity, Community and Ritual*, 149-61, 165, "Sexual activity in general, and sexual sin in particular, are hazardous to the soul and body, and totally inimical to a person's context with God." On Paul in particular, see 1 Thess 4:1-8, 1 Cor 5:9-13, 6:19, and Rom 1:18-32.

³⁰ Petrovic and Petrovic, *Inner Purity*, 263-98.

³¹ Milgrom, *Studies in Cultic Theology*, 77, "Impurity was feared because it was demonic." DDD, 237, 239, on πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον and πνεῦμα πονηρόν in, i.e., Mark 5, Luke, Rev 18:2: "From these passages one learns the nature and function of demons in the New Testament era: to defile and bring to evil their human subjects and hosts, in both physical and spiritual ways." Further, Blidstein, *Purity, Community, and Ritual*, 185-202.

since it is possible to view the language of righteousness as signaling another kind of discourse, namely legal discourse. But, the language of righteousness also appears in connection to the ideas of purity. I noted this already in relation to the word ἀδικία. In addition, 1 Cor 6:9-11 refers to justification as coming through purification: baptism effects both sanctification and justification (6:10-11), cleansing the ἁδικοί (6:9).³² This accords with another text that associates these ideas, 1 QS XI, 11-15, which James Dunn cited as relevant for understanding justification in Romans:

As for me, if I stumble, the mercies of God shall be my eternal salvation. If I stagger because of the sin of flesh, my justification will be by the righteousness of God which endures forever...He will draw me near by his grace, and by his mercy he will bring my justification...Through his righteousness he will cleanse me of all uncleanness of man and of the sins of the children of men, that I may confess to God his righteousness, and his majesty to the most High.³³

Here the justification of the writer is through the righteousness of God, and the writer's justification entails being purified from "all the uncleanness of man and the sins of the children of men." These dynamics are present in Paul's account of justification in Romans. A further indication that Romans 1 is an instance of purity discourse is the reference, in Rom 1:23, 24, 26, and 29, to the loss of divine presence. Granted, this is an argument this analysis works towards

³² See also Rom 6:19, where ἀκαθαρσία and δικαιοσύνη are juxtaposed; coordination of righteousness and purity language in 1 Thess 2:10, Phil 1:10-11. Note also Rom 5:9, "justified by his blood (δικαιωθέντες νῦν ἐν τῷ αἵματι αὐτοῦ)." So, the people are justified by a purgative agent, further suggesting the association of justification and purity.

³³ Cited in Dunn, *Theology of Paul the Apostle*, 343. Translation from Geza Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English*, 88. See also 1QH IV, 34-37: "For thou wilt pardon iniquity, and through Thy righteousness [Thou wilt purify man] of his sin" (Vermes, 203).

rather than works from, but it is worth mentioning here that others have noted the loss of divine presence in Romans 1 and the connection of this with impurity.³⁴

In addition to the considerations drawn from the immediate literary context of Romans 1, there are further factors, drawn from elsewhere in Paul's letters, that suggest the dynamics of purity in Romans 1. There is, first, the parallel of Rom 1:18-32 with 1 Thess 4:1-8. The connection of the two texts has been noted in previous research.³⁵ 1 Thessalonians 4 is an appeal for the Thessalonians to live and please God particularly in the realm of sexual ethics, and the ideas and language of purity occur throughout the passage. These ideas and language correspond to what appears in Romans 1. The reference in 1 Thess 4:1-8 to "lustful passion" (πάθος ἐπιθυμίας), specifically of gentiles (4:5), parallels Rom 1:24 and 1:26-27. The reference to God's wrath, "the Lord is an avenger" (4:6), parallels Rom 1:18. The focus on sexual morality in 1 Thessalonians 4 parallels Rom 1:26-27. And, moreover, the appeal to divine presence and the necessity of purity in 1 Thess 4:7-8 accords with the references to the loss of divine presence in Rom 1:23-28. That Paul employs the ideas and language of cultic purity and divine presence in 1 Thessalonians 4 is widely recognized,³⁶ and, given the extensive parallels between Romans 1 and 1 Thessalonians 4, it is appropriate also to view Romans 1 in this way.

A related point comes from an observation about 1 Thessalonians 4 coordinated with a point about the function of Romans 1 within the argument of Romans. Three times in a span of six verses, in 1 Thess 4:1-8, Paul refers to previous teaching.³⁷ This suggests that Paul framed his

³⁴ Origen, *Romans*, 1.18.10, 1.19.5-7; cf. Leenhardt, *Romans*, 65-66.

³⁵ Michael Newton, *The Concept of Purity*, 102-04; Stowers, *Rereading of Romans*, 97.

³⁶ Gordon D. Fee, *God's Empowering Presence*, 50-53; Stowers, *Rereading of Romans*, 97; Maren Bohlen, *Sanctorum Communio: Die Christen als 'Heilige' bei Paulus* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2011) 116-17, 134-37; Gorman, *Apostle of the Crucified Lord*, 200-202; Blidstein, *Purity, Community, and Ritual*, 151.

³⁷ 1 Thess 4:1, 2, 6: "As you learned from us how you ought to live and please God...For you know what instructions we gave you...just as we already told you beforehand and solemnly warned you."

original teaching and preaching to the Thessalonians in terms of purity, among other things, and seemingly in a way that parallels what appears in 1 Thessalonians 4. Turning back to Romans, it is widely held that one of the central purposes behind writing the letter is to introduce the Romans to the gospel he preached in the eastern Roman empire.³⁸ Within this, further, Rom 1:18-32, following the reference to “my gospel” in 1:15-17, is thought to be the beginning of the narration of Paul’s gospel. Coordinating 1 Thessalonians 4 with these observations, we should expect Paul to frame his gospel in terms of purity, which is, according to my reading, what we find in Romans 1. Paul sets out the gospel in terms of purity, just as he appears to have done in his original teaching to the Thessalonians.

This accords with certain other observations from within Paul’s letters. As noted above, 1 Cor 6:9-11 presents the function of baptism, the ritual of entrance into the community, as washing, sanctifying, and justifying.³⁹ This suggests that Paul had earlier told the Corinthians that they were unjust and impure. Further, in 1 Cor 3:16 and 6:19 Paul appears to refer to previous teaching (“Do you not know?”) in reference to the Corinthians’ status as God’s temple and the necessity of purity. And, moreover, Paul envisions people outside of the community as impure and people within the community as pure (1 Cor 7:12-16), and this probably reflects how Paul typically framed issues when founding his communities. Another point, in this connection, is Paul’s characterization of the gospel in Rom 15:16. Paul states that he is a minister “in the priestly service of the gospel of God (ἱεραουργοῦντα τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ θεοῦ), so that the offering

³⁸ Jervell, *Imago Dei*, 312; Nils Dahl, *Studies in Paul* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1977) 77: “What Paul does in this letter is what he had for a long time hoped to do in person: he preached the gospel to those in Rome.” Beverly R. Gaventa, “‘To Preach the Gospel’: Romans 1,15 and the Purposes of Romans,” in *The Letter to the Romans* (ed. Udo Schnelle; BETL 226; Leuven: Peeters, 2009) 188; Schnabel, *Römer*, 43.

³⁹ On the purifying function of baptism in Paul, see Newton, *The Concept of Purity*, 82-83; Klawans, *Impurity and Sin*, 154; Hayes, *Gentile Impurities and Jewish Identities*, 104n.17. The baptism cleanses moral impurity and is the means of entrance into the community.

of the gentiles may be acceptable, sanctified by the holy spirit (ἵνα γένηται ἡ προσφορὰ τῶν ἔθνων εὐπρόσδεκτος, ἡγιασμένη ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ).” This statement, heavy with cultic vocabulary, presents the effect of the gospel as purifying gentiles.⁴⁰ This supports the premise both that Paul regularly set up original teaching and preaching in terms of purity and impurity and that Romans 1 is an instance of purity discourse.⁴¹ These many factors, then; the terms Paul uses, which have cultic resonances; the specific ideas that accord with purity discourse; the connection with 1 Thessalonians 4; and the point about the nature of Paul’s teaching and preaching; coalesce to give a strong sense that Rom 1:18-32 is an instance of purity discourse. This view is affirmed throughout the rest of the discussion. This recognition of the nature of Rom 1:18-32 affects how we understand the content of the passage and the trajectory of the argument of Romans.

1.3 The Argument of Rom 1:18-32: People Choose Idols and Become Impure; God Leaves People to Impurity; People Debased

Thus, we see that Rom 1:18-32 is an instance of purity discourse. Recognizing this, we may interpret what Paul says in the text through close attention to the language and logic in view. As noted above, Paul’s statement in Rom 1:18, what others have recognized as the thematic

⁴⁰ On the gentiles themselves as being purified and offered, see Sarah Whittle, *Covenant Renewal and the Consecration of the Gentiles* (SNTSMS 161; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014) 158-84.

⁴¹ Certain readers might object to the reading of Rom 1:18-32 offered here on the basis of the emphasis, in Rom 15:16 and 1 Thessalonians 4, on the impurity of gentiles. One might argue that these texts point in favor of an exclusively gentile referent in Rom 1:18-32 (as in the argument of Stowers, *Rereading of Romans*, 88-97, 276). It is true that Paul refers explicitly to gentile impurity in Rom 15:16, and in no place in the letters does Paul refer to ethnic Jews specifically as morally impure. On the other hand, Paul does refer to the “sins” of ethnic Jews in 1 Thess 2:14-16 and in Gal 4:25 refers to Jerusalem as “in slavery with her children,” a reference to ethnic Jews. The presentation of Jews as morally impure is not a far conceptual leap from referring to Jews in general as in bondage and in need of the spirit (Gal 5:1-26). Further, the reference to specifically gentile impurity in Rom 15:16 and 1 Thessalonians 4 need not be determinative for the argument presented in Romans 1-3. As stated before, in Romans 1-3 Paul seeks to place Jews and gentiles in the same situation vis-à-vis sin.

statement,⁴² squares with the norms of purity discourse: “For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven (ἀποκαλύπτεται γὰρ ὀργὴ θεοῦ ἀπ’ οὐρανοῦ) against all impurity and injustice of those (ἐπὶ πᾶσαν ἀσέβειαν καὶ ἀδικίαν ἀνθρώπων) who by injustice suppress the truth (τῶν τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἐν ἀδικίᾳ κατεχόντων).” Here Paul applies the wrath of God to all his present people, just as he applied the need for the righteousness of God to all people in Rom 1:15-17. The wrath of God presently revealed in Rom 1:18 is depicted in Rom 1:23, 26, and 28: the “wrath of God revealed” is the “handing over” of the people.⁴³ Throughout Rom 1:18-32 there is fluctuation between present and past. Paul holds that what he says applies to all present people, but he, beginning with Rom 1:21, shifts to an unspecified primeval historical moment when humans chose idols over God.⁴⁴ Breaking down the broad features of the logic of the passage, Paul holds that, first, at some primeval historical moment humans gave up the presence of God for idols through idolatry, and as a result God, as an expression of wrath, “handed them over” to impurity and thus to the “dishonoring of their bodies.” This handing over resulted in further sinfulness, which brings Paul’s people-apart-from-Christ, according to the passage, up to the present: “Therefore you,” Paul’s proud, all-inclusive interlocutor in Rom 2:1, “are without excuse.”⁴⁵

The specifics of Rom 1:18-32 must be examined in detail. The reference to God’s wrath applies to Paul’s present people, as do the references to impiety and injustice. Romans 1:19-20 is concerned with establishing the guilt of all people vis-à-vis knowledge. Paul in these verses states that from the creation of the world people have been able to understand the power and nature of God. Romans 1:21-23 envisions the turn to idols that is the cause of the handing over

⁴² Käsemann, *Romans*, 37-44; Longenecker, *Romans*, 199.

⁴³ Thus, Käsemann, *Romans*, 37, 44; Gorman, *Apostle of the Crucified Lord*, 413.

⁴⁴ Jewett, *Romans*, 156-57. The specific temporal referent is not made clear. On this point, Martin, *Sex and the Single Savior*, 52-53, is right: “Once upon a time...”

⁴⁵ On δὴ in Rom 2:1 as inferential, see Cranfield, *Romans*, 140; Dunn, *Romans 1-8*, 79; Stowers, *Rereading of Romans*, 103; Richard Longenecker, *Romans*, 244-45.

of Rom 1:24-31. Paul states in Rom 1:21 that though the people knew God “they did not glorify God as God or give thanks to him (ὡς θεὸν ἐδόξασαν ἢ ὑπαρίστησαν), but they became foolish in their reasoning and their senseless mind was darkened.” The verse has idolatry as part of its referent: the primeval people did not glorify God or give thanks to him but instead worshipped idols. Paul refers to becoming foolish and darkened in their hearts in 1:21, in anticipation of the reference to devolution into debauchery in Rom 1:24-32.

The claim, “They did not glorify God as God,” has occasioned different interpretive emphases. Calvin held that this refers to failure to worship God with a right understanding of God, in line with the reference to glorifying God “as God.”⁴⁶ Others posit that Rom 1:21 refers to the failure not to reflect God’s glory back to God through ethical conformity.⁴⁷ This interpretation misunderstands the way the language of glory works in praise contexts. The correct framework within which to understand the language is the framework of divine patronage.⁴⁸ This is suggested, not only due to the use of glory as praise, but also the connection of δοξάζω with εὐχαριστέω.⁴⁹ Thus, the language of glorifying and thanksgiving in Rom 1:21 means to offer God praise on account of his benefaction towards the people. Failure to do this is to infringe on the reciprocal relationship that exists between God and creation.

The reference to failure to glorify God and give thanks to God implies that the people worshipped other gods. This is implied, further, in Rom 1:23, where Paul refers to the glory of God on the one hand and various images on the other. The verse states, “And they exchanged the

⁴⁶ Calvin, *Romans*, 71-72; also C. K. Barrett, *Romans*, 36.

⁴⁷ Berry, *Glory in Romans*, 15: “To glorify God is to respond appropriately with one’s whole life to the revelation of God’s glory—to live in such a way that one’s life reflects the truth about God that has been made known to them.” Cf. O’Brien, *Introductory Thanksgiving in the Letters of Paul*, 183, on 2 Thess 1:12, “Christ’s splendour will be reflected in their transformed lives, so bringing glory to Him.”

⁴⁸ So, compare with Cranfield, *Romans*, 117; Bruce Longenecker, *Eschatology and the Covenant*, 172-73.

⁴⁹ On this see chapter 3 section 1.1, 2.3.

glory of the immortal God (καὶ ἡλλάξαν τὴν δόξαν τοῦ ἀφθάρτου θεοῦ) for images resembling a mortal human being or birds or four-footed creatures or reptiles (ἐν ὁμοιώματι εἰκόνος φθαρτοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ πετεινῶν καὶ τετραπόδων καὶ ἑρπετῶν).” The verse has idolatry in view, but to say this is not to capture the full import of the statement. Paul states that primeval human chose to have the images of idols over the presence of God. This interpretation recognizes the linguistic parallels of OG Ps 105:20 and Jer 2:11: these state (OG Ps 105:20), “They exchanged their glory for the likeness of a bull eating grass (καὶ ἡλλάξαντο τὴν δόξαν αὐτῶν ἐν ὁμοιώματι μόσχου ἔσθοντος χόρτον),” and (OG Jer 2:11) “the people exchanged their glory for that which will not profit them (ὁ δὲ λαός μου ἡλλάξατο τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ, ἐξ ἧς οὐκ ὠφεληθήσονται).” These texts refer to Israel’s choice of idols over God, and Paul adopts the scriptural language originally applied to Israel to make a point about humanity in general.

Further examination of the reasons for understanding Rom 1:23 as the exchange of God’s presence for idols must be given. The coordination of δόξα with εἰκὼν suggests that Paul has a cultic representation of the divine in view in both cases. In addition, that Paul τὴν δόξαν τοῦ ἀφθάρτου θεοῦ coupled with ἐν ὁμοιώματι εἰκόνος φθαρτοῦ points against reading τὴν δόξαν τοῦ ἀφθάρτου θεοῦ as an objective genitive, thus “glory to the immortal God,” since the parallel phrase ἐν ὁμοιώματι εἰκόνος φθαρτοῦ does not have a verbal idea.⁵⁰ There is also the question of the meaning of ἀλλάσσω. The reading “exchange possession of” was established in the linguistic investigation of Wally Cirafesi. Cirafesi made this case on the basis of the linguistic connection between Rom 1:23 and 3:23.⁵¹ Cirafesi notes that in both verses the verbs connected to the glory

⁵⁰ Noted in Blackwell, “Immortal Glory,” 295n.31.

⁵¹ Cirafesi, “‘To Fall Short’ or ‘To Lack’? Reconsidering the Meaning and Translation of ὙΣΤΕΡΕΩ in Rom 3:23,” *ExpTim* 123 (2012): 429-34. See also Stanley E. Porter and Wally V. Cirafesi, “ὕστερέω and πίστις Χριστοῦ in Romans 3:23: A Response to Steven Enderlein,” *Journal for the Study of Paul and his Letters* 3 (2013): 1-9.

of God, ἀλλάσσω in Rom 1:23 and ὑστερέω in Rom 3:23, share the semantic domain of possession.⁵² Accordingly, Cirafesi highlights that every other middle/passive occurrence of ὑστερέω in Paul's letters carries the sense "to lack possession of."⁵³ Turning back to Rom 1:23, these factors suggest the sense "to exchange possession of" for ἀλλάσσω. There are other reasons, further, to see a connection between Rom 1:23 and 3:23, which we discuss in this analysis, but these points are enough to establish the meaning of the verb ἀλλάσσω. So, in Rom 1:23, Paul says that the people gave up possession of God's glory, in the sense of God's presence, in favor of idols.

The interpretations of Romans 1 that find allusion to Adam hold that the "glory of the immortal God" in Rom 1:23 is the glory of God ≈ image of God of Genesis 1.⁵⁴ We have already noted that Romans 1 does not refer to Adam and Genesis. In relation to the proposal of the "glory of God" as a human quality, this does not square with the context of Rom 1:23, which sets "glory" in contrast to "images," as in two representations of divine presence. This account of the meaning of glory and images is in line with our reading of the use of the language of glory and image in 2 Cor 4:4. There, for Paul to say, "the gospel of the glory of Christ" (τῆς δόξης τοῦ Χριστοῦ), who is "the image of God (εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ)," means that Christ is the representation of divine presence among the people. This definition of "image" in 2 Cor 4:4 squares with the context of Rom 1:18-32 and provides support for our reading of Rom 1:23.

Paul refers to divine presence again in Rom 1:24, 26, and 28 with the reference to God's handing over as the expression of wrath. Romans 1:24 states, "Therefore God handed them over in the lusts of their hearts to impurity (διὸ παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεὸς ἐν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις τῶν

⁵² Cirafesi, "To Fall Short' or 'To Lack'?" 431-32.

⁵³ 1 Cor 1:7, 88, 12:24; 2 Cor 11:9; Phil 4:12. Ibid., 432.

⁵⁴ Jervell, *Imago Dei*, 312-31; Hooker, "Adam in Romans 1," 305; Ortlund, "Inaugurated Glorification," 117; Jacob, *Conformed to the Image*, 101-03.

καρδιῶν αὐτῶν εἰς ἀκαθαρσίαν), to the dishonoring of their bodies among themselves (τοῦ ἀτιμάζεσθαι τὰ σώματα αὐτῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς).” Παραδίδωμι + εἰς usually denotes handing over to someone or something.⁵⁵ In Rom 1:24, the handing over is to impurity. Impurity here is understood as “the aerial miasma which possessed magnetic attraction for the realm of the sacred”; the “dynamic force” that was “magnetic and malefic to the sphere of the sacred.”⁵⁶ The logic is that God cannot be in the presence of impurity, the impurity caused by people’s idolatry; and thus God moves away, leaving the people to the influence of the impurity. The definition of impurity as a “dynamic force” or “power” is at play: impurity corrupts the people, leading to the “dishonoring of their bodies among themselves.” Paul further expresses the result of the handing over in terms of, in 1:26, the “dishonorable passions,” and in 1:28 to the “corrupted minds,” on account of which the people did “things that should not be done.” The demonic influence of impurity is at play in the σῶμα of the people (24) and this also corrupts the νοῦς (28) and results in dishonorable passions.

Here it is again worthwhile to cite 1 Thessalonians 4. The gentiles who do not know God in 1 Thessalonians 4 are guided by lustful passion (5), and this is connected to ἀκαθαρσία (7). Paul appeals to being called not to impurity but to ἁγιασμός, and Paul refers to the holy spirit within people (8). The logic is that they must stay pure because the holy spirit is in their midst, Further support for the reading of Rom 1:24-32 in terms of the influence of impurity is the parallel discussion of the influence of “sin” in Romans 6-8. Paul refers to sin “exercising

⁵⁵ 2 Cor 4:11, Matt 10:21, 17:22, Acts 8:3; cf. 1 Cor 5:5, “You are to hand this person to satan for the destruction of the flesh (παραδοῦναι τὸν τοιοῦτον τῷ σατανᾷ εἰς ὄλεθρον τῆς σαρκός).” Noted in Beverly Gaventa, “God Handed Them Over,” in *Our Mother Saint Paul* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2007) 113-23.

⁵⁶ Milgrom, *Studies in Cultic Theology*, 77, 79. Dunn, *Romans 1-8*, 62, asserts that ἀκαθαρσία in Rom 1:24 has “almost entirely lost its earlier cultic connotation and bears a clear moral sense.” Dunn makes this claim without argumentation (so, also, Lohse, *Römer*, 89-90). “Cultic” or “moral” is a false dichotomy (on ritual and moral impurity, see chapter 2 section 2.3).

dominion in your mortal bodies” in 6:12. In that context, however, the people have a choice over whether to allow sin to influence their bodies. In Romans 1:18-32, there is no choice: the people are under the influence of “impurity.” On the connection of “impurity” with “sin,” there is 6:19, where Paul substitutes ἁμαρτία with ἀκαθαρσία, and, further, Paul refers to both ἀδικία and ἐπιθυμία in connection with sin in Rom 6:12-13, and Paul associates these with the influence of ἀκαθαρσία in Rom 1:18-32 (18, 24, 29). There is, further, the parallel influence of impurity and sin on the σῶμα (1:24, 6:12, 7:24). So, these factors point in favor of seeing the influence of impurity on people’s bodies in Rom 1:18-32.⁵⁷

Further, on the connection of “God handed them over” with movement away from the people, the idea of God’s movement away on account of idolatry and impurity was conventional in ancient Judaism. This appears in OG Ps 77:58-60: “And they provoked him to anger with their hills and made him jealous with their carved images. God heard and disdained and was livid at Israel, and he rejected the tent of Selom (καὶ ἀπόσατο τὴν σκηνὴν Σηλωμ), his dwelling, where he dwelled among people.” Ezekiel and Josephus make the connection with impurity explicit. Ezekiel watches as, due to the impurity of the people and the wrath of God this produces, the glory of God departs from the temple.⁵⁸ Josephus states, reporting on the destruction of the temple, “Even God himself, for loathing of their impiety (μισήσαντα τὴν ἀσέβειαν αὐτῶν [cf. Rom 1:18]), turned away from our city and, because he deemed the temple to be no longer a clean dwelling place for him (τὸ δὲ ἱερόν οὐκέτι καθαρὸν οἰκητήριον αὐτῷ), brought the Romans

⁵⁷ On which see Gaventa “God Handed Them Over,” 113-23. Gaventa affirms the connection of sin and impurity between Rom 1:18-32 and Romans 6-8.

⁵⁸ OG Ezekiel 8-11: (8:10) “I looked, and behold, vain abominations and all the idols of the house of Israel were portrayed on it all around...[9:7] ‘Defile the house (Μιάνετε τὸν οἶκον), and fill the roads with the dead as you go out’...[10:10] ‘My eye will not spare, nor will I show pity; I have given their ways against their heads’...[10:18] The glory of the Lord went out from the house...[11:9] ‘I will hand you over to the hands of foreigners’ (παραδώσω ὑμᾶς εἰς χεῖρας ἀλλοτρίων).”

upon us and purification by fire upon the city (τῇ πόλει καθάρσιον πῦρ).” Further, as discussed before, Paul appeals to the necessity of purity for the dwelling of the holy spirit in 1 Thess 4:8, 1 Cor 3:16, 6:19, and 2 Cor 6:14-7:1, and the logic of these texts parallels our account of Rom 1:24-31.⁵⁹ Moreover, in support of their reading, is the attestation of the reading in early Christian interpreters. That “handing over” involved God’s movement away was an early interpretive trope. Chrysostom defined παρέδωκεν in 1:24 as “left them alone” and understood God’s action on analogy with a general leaving soldiers in battle or a king leaving spoiled children to their own devices.⁶⁰ Theodoret of Cyrrhus interpreted the phrase as God “simply abandoned them.”⁶¹ Origen connected the verse with impurity, citing 1 Cor 6:19: “If someone who, although he has known God, should not honor him as God...it is scarcely to be doubted that the soul of such a person has been forsaken by God and handed over...It is not possible for God to have dwelling with these evils or for these evils to proceed from the place where God dwells.”⁶² These interpreters, well attuned to Greek and features of Paul’s logic, indicate the plausibility of the reading.

Thus, in Rom 1:24, 26, and 28, Paul refers to God’s handing over as God’s movement away from the people leaving them to the influence of impurity, which has a corrupting effect on

⁵⁹ Klawans, *Impurity and Sin*, 154-55, supposes that Paul imagined that the holy spirit might depart from the righteous if they continue in impurity. Paul never makes this explicit, but the force of the appeal appears based on the possibility. On the departure of the holy spirit, see T. Sol 26:6-7, “So the spirit of God departed from me and from that day on my words because as idle talk. She convinced me to build temples of idols. As a result, I, wretched man that I am, carried out her advice and the glory of God completely departed from me.”

⁶⁰ *Homilies*, 40, “For as he that hath command in an army, if upon the battle lying heavy upon him he retreat and go away, gives up his soldiers to the enemies...by stripping them of his own assistance. Thus too did God leave those that were not minded to receive what cometh from Him.”

⁶¹ Theodoret, *Interpretation of the Letter to the Romans*. PG 82, translation from ACCS 6.45. Augustine on Rom 1:24, “God abandoned them to the desires of their own hearts.” *Augustine on Romans 5* in ACCS 6.44-45.

⁶² Origen, *Romans*, 1.19.5-7; 1.18.10.

their bodies and minds. Paul refers to sexual immorality as an expression of “dishonorable passion” (1:26-27), and then Paul lists the vices with which the people were “filled” (1:29-31): injustice, evil, greed, wickedness... The vice lists parallels 1 Cor 6:9-11, where Paul refers to God’s agency to (ἀγνίζω), sanctify (ἀγιάζω), and justify (δικαιόω) the ἄδικοι (6:9). Paul sets up the people as ἄδικοι in 1:18-32 and refers to God’s means of justifying people in Rom 3:21-26.

1.4. Summary and Note about Glory

We noted, then, that Rom 1:18-32 is purity discourse that sets up the general human condition in terms of the lack of divine presence due to impurity and the degeneration into immorality that stems from this. God moved away from the people on account of wrath, leaving them to the influence of impurity. The language of glory, within the section, refers to praise to God for God’s benefits (praise that the people did not offer) and the presence of God among the people, which the people gave up for idols.

2. Glory in Rom 3:21-26: All People Impure and Without Divine Presence; Jesus the Place of Atonement

2.1 Preliminary Issues

Before turning to exegesis of Rom 3:21-26 it is necessary to note the broad features of the rhetorical progression of Rom 2:1-3:20. Romans 2 proceeds in the mode of a diatribe with two imaginary interlocutors.⁶³ Romans 2:1 states, “Therefore you have no excuse, whoever you are, the one who judges; for in condemning others you condemn yourself, for you do the same things.” The statement builds on Rom 1:18-32 and reflects the universal applicability of what

⁶³ Stanley K. Stowers, *The Diatribe and Paul’s Letter to the Romans* (SBLDS 57; Chico: Scholars, 1981).

Paul says in the earlier passage. The first interlocutor, in Rom 2:1-5, is any person, while the second, in 2:17-24, is specifically a Jew.⁶⁴ The interlocutors are the subject of Paul's reference to boasting in Rom 2:17, 23, 3:27, and 4:2. Paul assumes God's impartiality in Rom 2:1-16. Only good people will enjoy final eschatological blessing. Those who do evil will experience God's punishment (2:8). In 2:17-24 Paul charges the Jewish interlocutor with sinfulness and breaking the law. The interlocutor is not functioning as a Jewish person was intended: instead of being a light to the blind and following the law, the "embodiment of knowledge and truth" (2:20) the Jewish interlocutor is a transgressor of the law. Importantly, in both dialogues Paul emphasizes the need for divine presence. In 2:12-16 Paul refers to a gentile in Christ who has the spirit, indicated by the reference the law written on the heart in 2:15.⁶⁵ Paul refers to the agency of the spirit in hearts again in 2:29, "and circumcision is of the heart, by the spirit, not by the letter (ἐν πνεύματι οὐ γράμματι)." The connection of these references to Romans 1 is the idea that divine presence is needed for virtue. When God is absent, the people devolve into debauchery,⁶⁶ but the spirit in people's hearts leads to virtue.

In Romans 3:1-8 Paul resumes the dialogue with the fictive Jewish interlocutor and responds to potential objections and false conclusions.⁶⁷ Paul states that Jews are at an advantage insofar as they have scripture and specifically its promises (3:1-4). Jews are not at an advantage,

⁶⁴ I am unconvinced by the thesis of Runar Thorsteinsson (*Paul's Interlocutor in Romans 2: Function and Identity in the Context of Ancient Epistolography* [Coniectanea Biblica. New Testament Series 40; Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 2003]; followed in Rodríguez and Thiessen, *The So-Called Jew in Paul's Letter to the Romans*; Fredriksen, *Paul*, 156-57), that the interlocutor of Rom 2:17-24 is a gentile proselyte or potential proselyte.

⁶⁵ On the spirit in hearts in Paul, see 2 Cor 1:22, 3:3; Gal 4:6; Rom 2:29; 5:5.

⁶⁶ So, Leenhardt, *Romans*, 66, "Men were free to refuse God, but they were not free to remove the consequences of this refusal. In face of God, so long as man is in communion with Him, man is free...But as soon as man ceases to dwell in divine presence...he loses freedom; the slavery of man begins."

⁶⁷ Frank J. Matera, *Romans* (Paideia; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2010) 78-83; followed in Rodríguez, *If You Call Yourself a Jew*, 64-65.

however, concerning the devolution into sin and impurity (3:9). In Rom 3:5-8 Paul flatly rejects the rationale that people should do evil that God might show himself faithful and thus receive glory. Paul, in 3:9, makes the summary statement that is supposed to encapsulate what has argued up that point: “We have already charged that all, both Jews and Greeks, are under sin (ὅφ’ ἁμαρτίαν εἶναι).” Paul had not used the term ἁμαρτία up to this point, though he had referred to people sinning (2:12, “as many sinned without the law (γὰρ ἀνόμως ἥμαρτον)...” In our reading, ἁμαρτία in 3:9 refers to the impure force in view in Rom 1:18-32 that Paul designated with the term ἀκαθαρσία. So, the sense of Rom 3:9 is that all people, Jews and gentiles, are in the situation described in Rom 1:18-32 and thus in need of divine intervention. In Rom 3:20, Paul states that through the agency of the law no flesh will be justified. This is a reference to the justification and cleansing from impurity that 1 QS XI, 11-15 has in view and that Paul refers to in 1 Cor 6:11. The law does not provide this. Apart from God’s action the law serves to reveal, as do the scriptural passages Paul cites in Rom 3:10-18, the ἀσέβεια and ἀδικία of people.

2.2 The Argument of Rom 3:21-26: God Justifies through Purification and Shows Himself Just; Jesus the Place of Atonement

Romans 3:21-26 presents the righteousness of God both as God’s saving activity to make people right and the way God shows himself righteous.⁶⁸ Romans 3:21 represents a turning point in the letter where Paul moves from talking about the general human condition to referring to its

⁶⁸ So, Katherine Grieb, “The Righteousness of God,” in *Reading Paul’s Letter to the Romans* (ed. Jerry L. Sumney; Atlanta: SBL, 2012) 65-77; Dunn, *Theology*, 342-44; V. P. Furnish, “Living to God, Walking in Love: Theology and Ethics in Romans,” in *Reading Paul’s Letter to the Romans*, 188.

solution. The passage represents Paul's own logic and creativity.⁶⁹ Two central points of argumentation are put forward here in relation to the section. First, I argue that the situation to which Paul refers in Rom 3:23 is the situation of impurity, wrath, and lack of divine presence referred to in Rom 1:18-32 and 3:9. Second, I argue that in Rom 3:25 Jesus functions, on analogy with Yom Kippur, to purify the people of impurity, address the wrath of God, and make divine presence again possible. The fact that purity dynamics are at play in Rom 3:23-25 has been overlooked in almost all scholarship.⁷⁰ That this is the case is ironic given the longstanding interest in the possible sacrificial meaning of Rom 3:25.

In Rom 3:22-23 Paul states, "For there is no distinction (οὐ γάρ ἐστιν διαστολή), for all sinned and lack the glory of God (πάντες γὰρ ἥμαρτον καὶ ὑστεροῦνται τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ)."

⁶⁹ Certain interpreters argue that Paul cites preformed material in Rom 3:24-26 (Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament* [trans. Kendrick Grobel; Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2007] 46-47; Ernst Käsemann ("Zum Verständnis von Römer 3,24-26," *ZNW* 43 [1950]: 150-54; Peter Stühlmacher, "Zur neueren Exegese von Röm 3,24-26," in *Jesus und Paulus: Festschrift für Werner Georg Kümmel zum 70 Geburtstag* [eds. E. E. Ellis, E. Grässer; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975] 313-33; Ben F. Myer, "The Pre-Pauline Formula in Rom. 3:25-26a," *NTS* 29 [1983] 198-208; Longenecker, *Romans*, 394-98). However, scholarship has not been able to settle what comes from Paul and what comes from source material (Rodríguez, *If You Call Yourself a Jew*, 82n.30). Aspects of Romans 3:24-26 prove central within the logic of Romans 1-3. The section provides the solution of purifying people so that God's presence, and the life of virtue that results from this, may be enjoyed. Thus, even if Paul is citing something in these verses, what he says reflects the logic that appears earlier in the letter and continues to appear in the discussion. Dunn ("Paul's Understanding of the Death of Jesus," in *Reconciliation and Hope. New Testament Essays on Atonement and Eschatology Presented to L.L. Morris on his 60th Birthday* [Carlisle: Paternoster, 1974] 131) is right: "Even if the verse is a quotation, Paul gives it such a central place in a key passage of his exposition that it must be very expressive of his own thinking."

⁷⁰ Exceptions are Newton, *The Concept of Purity*, 77; Finlan, *The Background and Content*, 123-62. However, neither Newton nor Finlan recognize the dynamics of purity and the sense divine presence for glory in Rom 3:23. More typical is the handling of the subject in C. H. Dodd (ΙΛΑΣΚΕΣΘΑΙ, Its Cognates, Derivatives, and Synonyms, in the Septuagint," *JTS* 32 [1931]: 352-60), who observed that the language of atonement in the Greek Jewish scriptures often had a purity referent, but, when it came to Romans, Dodd referred to Jesus' death as an expiation, a clearing of guilt and means of forgiveness, rather than a purification (360). Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra (*The Impact of Yom Kippur on Early Christianity: The Day of Atonement from Second Temple Judaism to the Fifth Century* [WUNT 163; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003] 203), writing about Rom 3:25 in relation to Hebrews: "While there is purification terminology in Hebrews, it is missing in Romans 3, which speaks about sin." This is a false dichotomy (either sin or purification/impurity). Transgressions create impurity, and impurity influences people so that they transgress.

Interpretation of the verse has greatly varied, though there is broad assent that Paul is summarizing what he argued in Rom 1:18-3:20.⁷¹ Discussion of Rom 3:23 has focused on the meaning of δόξα τοῦ θεοῦ. Interpretations of the phrase are diverse: “approbation from God,” “honor and incorruption,” “divine quality of life,” “dominion,” “radiance,” “sanctifying grace,” and others.⁷² Modern interpretation has emphasized that Paul has Adam’s glory in view in the verse, and that this glory is in view in Rom 5:2 and again in Romans 8.⁷³ Dodd posed that the glory of God is the “divine likeness which man is intended to bear. Insofar as man departs from the likeness of God he is sinful. To come short of the glory of God is to sin.”⁷⁴ However, this account makes the phrase “the glory of God” a redundancy in view of the statement πάντες γὰρ ἥμαρτον, and, further, this does not align with Paul’s use of the language of glory elsewhere. A different theory is the interpretation of Jewett, that Rom 3:23 refers to a “transcendent standard of honor,” which all people, Jews and gentiles, fall to reach.⁷⁵ However, Jewett’s reading relies on a theory of competition over honor between Jews and gentiles in the Roman community, a theory that does not have strong support in the letter.⁷⁶ Further, the reading of Jewett does not square with the use of the language of the glory of God in the context of Romans 1-5, as discussed here.

⁷¹ Cranfield, *Romans*, 1.204; Moo, *Romans*, 226; Schnabel, *Römerbrief*, 386; Longenecker, *Romans*, 415.

⁷² Approbation from God: Calvin, *Romans*, 40; *Jewish New Testament*. Honor and incorruption: Blackwell, “Immortal Glory and the Problem of Death,” 298-303. Divine quality of life: Sprinkle, “The Afterlife in Romans,” 212-33. Dominion: Dunn, *Romans 1-8*, 178 (plus immortality, divine presence); Wright, *Paul and the Faithfulness of God*, 485-505; cf. Jacob, *Conformed to the Image*, 117, 21, *passim*. Radiance: Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, 121; cf. Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 347. Sanctifying Grace: Boylan, *Romans*, 56. See chapter 1 section 2.2.

⁷³ Rückert, *Römer*, 144-47; Lietzmann, *Römer*, 49, 58; Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, 84-85; Barrett, *Romans*, 74; Jervell, *Imago Dei*, 312-31; Dunn, *Romans 1-8*, 178; “Adam and Christ,” 125-38; Berry, *Glory in Romans*, 49-66; Jacob, *Conformed to the Image*, 94-95. See chapter 1 section 2.3.

⁷⁴ Dodd, *Romans*, 51.

⁷⁵ Jewett, *Romans*, 280.

⁷⁶ On which see chapter 1 section 2.4.

The discussion of Wally Cirafesi is once again relevant. Cirafesi connected Rom 3:23 and 1:23 on the basis of the shared reference to the glory of God and the shared use of verbs that include the semantic domain of possession.⁷⁷ This connection is relevant for understanding Rom 3:23 both for its insight into the meaning of the verb ὑστερέω and for its insight into the logic at play in the verse. The connection of ὑστερέω in 3:23 with ἀλλάσσω in 1:23 means that possession is in view in both cases, and this squares with the observation that every other middle/passive ὑστερέω in Paul's letters carries the sense "to lack." So, the meaning of ὑστερέω in Rom 3:23 is "to lack." This means that most English translations of Rom 3:23 since the KJV, including the NRSV, are wrong, with a select few being right.⁷⁸ But, further, the linguistic link between Rom 1:23 and 3:23 suggests a conceptual link between Rom 3:23: that the dynamics of exchanging and lacking divine presence are in play between Rom 1:23 and 3:23. Moreover within this the glory of God is the same: the presence of God in Rom 1:23 is the presence of God lacked in Rom 3:23.

That the glory of God in Rom 1:23 and 3:23 is the same, and that the passages portray a consistent logic, is indicated further by the regular concentration of cultic terminology appearing in passages in Romans 1-5 that refer to the glory of God. Here it is necessary to draw into the discussion Rom 5:1-11, which is also a topic of discussion later in the chapter. There is a high volume of the language of cult and purity in Rom 1:18-32, 3:21-26, and 5:1-11. I have already noted this in relation to Rom 1:18-32. In Rom 3:21-26, there are, in addition to the reference to the glory of God, the terms ἱλαστήριον and αἷμα, both of which have cultic associations.⁷⁹

⁷⁷ Cirafesi, "'To Fall Short' or 'To Lack'?" 429-34.

⁷⁸ Douay-Rheims Bible, NJB, NAB; interestingly, as Cirafesi points out (Ibid., 430n.5), all the translations are from the Catholic tradition.

⁷⁹ ἱλαστήριον: OG Exod 25:17, 18, 19; Lev 16:2, 13, 14; Num 7:89; Amos 9:1. Stökl Ben Ezra, *The Impact of Yom Kippur*, 198-200. Αἷμα: OG Exod 24:6, 30:10; Lev 1:5, 11, 15, *passim*; Num 18:17, 19:4, *passim*.

Further, in Rom 5:1-11, Paul refers to the glory of God and uses the word προσαγωγή, a term used for access in relation to temples (5:2), and, again, αἷμα (5:9).⁸⁰ These factors strongly suggest a cultic dimension to Paul's use of the language of glory of God in Rom 1:23, 3:23, and 5:2, and that there is a connected rationale between these passages.

The cultic association of ὑστερέω is, further, indicated in 1 Cor 8:8, which occurs amid Paul's discussion of food sacrificed to idols. The NRSV reads 1 Cor 8:8, "Food will not bring us close to God.' We are no worse off if we do not eat (οὔτε ἐὰν μὴ φάγωμεν ὑστερούμεθα), and no better off if we do." BDAG notes, rightly, that the statement, "Food will not bring us close to God," employs cultic rather than law-court imagery.⁸¹ Here ὑστερέω appears in a cultic context and in connection with divine presence, just as in our reading of Rom 3:23. Paul confronts the idea that eating idol meat will have a bearing on one's proximity to God. The reading of Cirafesi, "If we do not eat, we do not lack [any advantage], nor if we do eat, do we abound [in advantage],"⁸² is compelling but needs further definition: the advantages relate to a person's proximity to God and not to advantages in general. The statement is conceptually related to the reference to the lack of divine presence in Rom 3:23.

In addition, drawing in a later text, Rev 21:11 confirms the grammatical viability of using a verb of possession in relation to glory of God as divine presence. Revelation 21:11 states, "The spirit...showed me the holy city Jerusalem coming down from heaven from God. It has the glory

⁸⁰ Προσάγω: OG Exod 29:4, 8, 29:10, 40:12, 14; Lev 1:2, 3, 10, *passim*; 1 Kgs 1:25; 2 Macc 12:43; προσαγωγή: Eph 2:18, 3:12. Nijay Gupta, *Worship that Makes Sense to Paul: A New Approach to the Theology and Ethics of Paul's Cultic Metaphors* (BZNW; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2010) 111-16; Wolter, *Römer*, 320-22. Certain interpreters have sought to diminish the cultic significance of αἷμα by stating that this is simply Paul's way of referring to Jesus' violent death (Stowers, *Rereading of Romans*, 210-11; Daniel C. Ullucci, *The Christian Rejection of Animal Sacrifice* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012) 75. But, that Paul uses the word αἷμα, rather than other words (i.e., θάνατος, σταυρὸς), and that this appears clustered with other cultic terms, strongly points in favor of a cultic referent.

⁸¹ BDAG s.v. παρίστημι.

⁸² Cirafesi, "To Fall Short' or 'To Lack'?" 432n.19.

of God (ἔχουσιν τὴν δόξαν τοῦ θεοῦ) and radiance like a jewel.”⁸³ Without positing here any literary or tradition-historical relationship, Romans 3:23 may be viewed as providing the negative counterpart to the statement of Revelation 21. In Revelation, the temple has the presence of God, while in Romans 1-3 the people lack the presence of God due to impurity.⁸⁴

Thus, these observations form a strong argument for seeing a reference to the glory of God as divine presence in Rom 3:23. The statement is that “all sinned and lack the glory of God.” This, as previous readings note, refers back to what Paul said in Romans 1:18-32. The statement “all sinned” is a claim about the status of people, that is, they are impure, under the influence of impurity. Accordingly, the statement, “they lack the glory of God,” is the statement that God is not among the people. These claims include the idea that God moved away as a form of wrath (1:18) and that the impurity was influencing people’s bodies and minds (1:24, 28).

This leads us to Rom 3:25, one the of the most notorious verses in the study of Paul. A past generation of scholarship focused on whether Jesus’ death in Rom 3:25 is more appropriately deemed a propitiation or an expiation.⁸⁵ More recently the emphasis has been on the question of whether sacrifice is even an appropriate category for understanding Paul’s language.⁸⁶ An influential critic of the longstanding sacrificial interpretation is Stanley Stowers.

⁸³ On the glory of God as divine presence in Rev 21:11, 23, see 21:3, “See the home of God is among mortals, he will dwell with them as their God...God himself will be with them.” See further, on the motif of divine presence in Revelation 21, Frey, “God’s Dwelling on Earth,” 79-103.

⁸⁴ Note the connection with purity in Rev 21:22-23, 27: “I saw no temple in the city, for its temple is the Lord God the almighty and the Lamb. And the city has no need of sun or moon to shine on it, for the glory of God is its light, and its lamp the Lamb...But nothing unclean will enter it, nor anyone who practices abomination or falsehood, but only those who are written in the Lamb’s book of life.”

⁸⁵ C. H. Dodd, “ΙΛΑΣΚΕΣΘΑΙ,” 352-60; Leon Morris, *The Atonement: Its Meaning and Significance* (Leicester: Inter-Varsity, 1983); Romans, 179-81; Dunn, “Paul’s Understanding of the Death of Jesus,” 137-41; Moo, *Romans*, 234-36; more recently, Toan J. Do, “The LXX Background of ΙΛΑΣΘΗΡΙΟΝ in Rom 3,25,” in *The Letter to the Romans* (ed. Udo Schnelle; BETL 226; Leuven: Peeters, 2009) 641-44.

⁸⁶ Against the sacrificial reading, see Stowers, *Rereading of Romans*, 206-26; Bradley H. McLean, *The Cursed Christ: Mediterranean Expulsion Rituals and Pauline Soteriology* (JSNTSup 126; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1996); Ullucci, *The Christian Rejection*, 74-77; Fredrksen, “Paul, Purity,

Among several points of critique, Stowers highlights that the traditional understanding of sacrifice in Rom 3:25 misunderstands the way sacrifice worked in early Judaism.⁸⁷ Stowers highlights that interpreters have long sought to find a reference to the חטאת, traditionally referred to as a “sin-offering,” in Rom 3:25. The problem with previous interpretations, Stowers states, is that they misrepresent the meaning of the sacrifice. Stowers notes, following the argument of Jacob Milgrom, that the חטאת is better called a “purification offering” rather than a “sin offering.”⁸⁸ Stowers highlights this in relation to the history of interpretation of Paul: “Interpreters commonly read Leviticus with specific Christian concepts of sin that supposed some ideal of a fall or original sin. The sacrifice in question would more accurately be called a purification offering.”⁸⁹ By referring to a “fall” or “original sin” Stowers refers to the connection of Rom 3:25 with the concept of Adam’s original sin, which, as discussed above, interpreters find in Rom 1:18-32. Stowers had already argued against the presence of allusion to Adam in Romans 1, and here he turns to consider this in relation to Rom 3:25.

Stowers goes on: “In terms of the cult’s ideology, failure to keep the temple pure meant to risk God’s anger and the loss of divine presence.”⁹⁰ Stowers had just made the observation that “in the priestly literature, such sacrifice cleanses not the one offering the sacrifice but the temple of impurity carried by the offender.”⁹¹ In this respect Stowers follows Milgrom, but this feature of Milgrom’s analysis was later challenged and corrected. The purification offerings of

and the *Ekklēsia* of the Gentiles,” 210-12; *Paul*, 245n.53; Aaron Glaim, “Reciprocity, Sacrifice, and Salvation in Judean Religion at the Turn of the Era” (Ph.D. diss., Brown University, 2014) 175-88. Defenders of the sacrificial reading have been Richard H. Bell, “Sacrifice and Christology in Paul,” *JTS* (2002): 1-27; Finlan, *The Background and Content*, 123-62.

⁸⁷ Stowers, *Rereading of Romans*, 206-26.

⁸⁸ Milgrom, *Studies in Cultic Theology*, 67-69.

⁸⁹ Stowers, *Rereading of Romans*, 207.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, 208.

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, 207.

Lev 4:1-5:13 and Leviticus 16 had the purpose of purging both the temple and people from sin and uncleanness.⁹² The purification offering, then, as Stowers recognizes, addressed God's wrath and the loss of divine presence. Stowers uses this as an argument against the sacrificial reading of Rom 3:25, but, in my view, the observation points in the opposite direction. Jesus' death in the passage functions as a means of addressing the situation of Rom 1:18-32, which Paul refers to again in Rom 3:23. The people were impure, which led to divine wrath and the movement of God away from the people, but Jesus as a sacrifice with the function of the Yom Kippur rituals cleanses the people of impurity and makes enjoyment of divine presence possible.

This claim must be substantiated on linguistic and exegetical grounds. In my translation the first part of 3:25 reads, "[Jesus,] whom God put forward as a place of atonement by his blood, which is through faith (ὃν προέθετο ὁ θεὸς ἱλαστήριον διὰ [τῆς] πίστεως ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι)." In this account, προτίθημι means "put forward"; ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι modifies ἱλαστήριον;⁹³ διὰ [τῆς] πίστεως signifies means;⁹⁴ and ἱλαστήριον denotes "place of atonement,"

⁹² Thus, Vis, "The Purgation of Persons through the Purification Offering," 33-57; anticipated in Anderson, "Sacrifice and Sacrificial Offerings (OT)," *ABD* 5.880.

⁹³ The coupling is standard in interpretation: the two conceptually relate to one another and it would be unusual to make blood the object of faith. So, NRSV, NIV, Cranfield, *Romans*, 1.210; Moo, *Romans*, 236-27; Wolter, *Römer*, 259; Longenecker, *Romans*, 431-42. Douglas Campbell (*The Rhetoric of Righteousness in Romans 3.21-26* [JSNTSup 65; Sheffield: JSOT, 1992] 62-69) and Bruce Longenecker ("ΠΙΣΤΙΣ in Romans 3.25: Neglected Evidence for the 'Faithfulness of Christ'?" *NTS* 39 [1993]: 478-80) instead connect "in his blood" with πίστις and hold that this is a point in favor of the reading "faithfulness" in Rom 3:25.

⁹⁴ Debates about the meaning of πίστις Χριστοῦ and related formulations, in Romans, Galatians, and Philippians, have, over the last thirty years, been detailed and intense (see Debbie Hunn, "Debating the Faithfulness of Jesus Christ in Twentieth-Century Scholarship," in *The Faith of Jesus Christ: Exegetical, Biblical, and Theological Studies* [eds. Michael Bird and Preston Sprinkle; Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2010] 15-32; Matthew C. Easter, "The *Pistis Christou* Debate: Main Arguments and Responses in Summary," *Currents in Biblical Research* 9 [2010]: 33-47). I do not engage in this discussion here. I slightly favor a reference to believer's faith in Rom 3:25. I would also couple this with ἱλαστήριον and thus read the phrase as meaning that the place of atonement is effective for people who have faith (so, Bell, "Sacrifice and Christology," 20; tentatively, Finlan, *The Background and Content*, 147). However, even if διὰ [τῆς] πίστεως refers to Jesus' faith, that people's faith is necessary for the effectiveness of the ἱλαστήριον is indicated already in 3:22, "the righteousness of God for all those who believe."

its base sense in the LXX. The reading “place of atonement” relies on the account of the origin of the word in the study of Daniel Bailey and the extension of Bailey’s analysis in Stephen Finlan.⁹⁵ Bailey showed that ἱλαστήριον is a LXX neologism, which probably existed before its adjectival counterpart in ordinary Greek, that signifies the place where the action of (ἐξ)ἱλάσκομαι is done, just as θυσιαστήριον (altar) is the place where one can θύω and a φυγαδευτήριον is a place to which one can flee.⁹⁶ Most words that end in –τήριον denote places.⁹⁷ Finlan posited, in view of the study of Bailey, that “place of atonement” is the base meaning of ἱλαστήριον in biblical usage: that while in most cases the ἱλαστήριον refers specifically to the lid of the ark in the holy of holies, “the mercy seat,” the definition “place of atonement” is general enough to account for instances where the term does not refer to the mercy seat.⁹⁸

Our definition of ἱλαστήριον as “place of atonement” is not meant, however, to downplay the connection with Leviticus 16. The mercy seat was one centrally important ἱλαστήριον, and, given the strong association of the term with the כפרת in Jewish usage, Paul likely had specifically the mercy seat as a ἱλαστήριον in view in the verse. The translation “place of atonement,” rather than “mercy seat,” in this connection, is due to the use of the term in the metaphor of Rom 3:25. As Finlan observes, “the specific referent is the mercy seat but...the real

⁹⁵ Daniel P. Bailey, “Jesus as the Mercy Seat: The Semantics and Theology of Paul’s Use of *Hilasterion* in Romans 3:25” (Ph.D. diss., University of Cambridge, 1999); Finlan, *The Background and Content*, 123-62.

⁹⁶ On the two uses of ἱλαστήριον, Bailey, “Jesus as the Mercy Seat,” 5-6: “The linguistic evidence for ἱλαστήριον up through the second century AD falls into two neat categories. First, there is a biblical use that designates the golden plate above the ark as the ‘place of atonement.’ This place of atonement is analogous to the biblical ‘place of sacrifice’ or θυσιαστήριον...Secondly, there is the Hellenistic use of ἱλαστήριον...[for] votive gifts dedicated to the gods.”

⁹⁷ On which Bailey, “Jesus as the Mercy Seat,” 235-36; Finlan, *The Background and Content*, 127-28. See also, i.e., ακροατήριον, a place of audience or lecture room.

⁹⁸ Ibid., 133-35. See Ezek 43:14 (3x), 17, 20; Amos 9:1.

significance of the metaphor is seen in its etymological meaning (‘place of atonement’).⁹⁹ Thus, with this reading of ἱλαστήριον in place, it remains to consider the meaning of “atonement,” the ἱλασκ- word group. Dodd is well-known for highlighting that in biblical use the language usually carries the sense of “performing an act whereby guilt or defilement is removed.”¹⁰⁰ The use of the construction ἐξιλάσκομαι plus περί and ὑπέρ occurs throughout Leviticus in connection with the purification of the Israelites and the sanctuary.¹⁰¹ Leviticus 16:16 states, “he shall cleanse the holy place from all the uncleanness of the children of Israel (ἐξιλάσεται τὸ ἅγιον ἀπὸ τῶν ἀκαθαρσιῶν τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ) and from their injustices, for all their sins (καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀδικημάτων αὐτῶν περὶ πασῶν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν).¹⁰² Numbers 35:33 uses the language of atonement while referring to defiling blood, “The land will not be cleansed from the blood (οὐκ ἐξιλασθήσεται ἡ γῆ ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος).” Here “blood” refers to the defilement of murder, whereas blood is often the purgative agent associated with the sacrifice.

In Rom 3:25 Paul refers to the purgative blood in connection with Jesus and the lid of the ark. The main point of the sacrificial imagery of Rom 3:25, as Finlan observes, is that God has provided a place where sprinkled blood purifies.¹⁰³ This accords with the use of the ἱλασκ- word group in the LXX and the use of the language of ἱλαστήριον and αἷμα in Rom 3:25 and it aligns with the account of the discursive trajectory of Romans offered in this analysis. This account

⁹⁹ Finlan, *The Background and Content*, 126.

¹⁰⁰ Dodd, “ἸΛΑΣΚΕΣΘΑΙ,” 359.

¹⁰¹ LXX Lev 1:4, 4:20, 26, 31, 35, 5:6, *passim*; LXX Num 6:11, 8:12, 19, *passim*.

¹⁰² LXX Exod 30:10, “And Aaron will make atonement on its horns once a year (καὶ ἐξιλάσεται ἐπ’ αὐτὸ Ααρων ἐπὶ τῶν κεράτων αὐτοῦ ἅπαξ τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ). By means of the blood of the purification of sins, the atonement (ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν τοῦ ἐξιλασμοῦ), once in a year he will purify it for their generations (ἅπαξ τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ καθαριεῖ αὐτὸ εἰς τὰς γενεὰς αὐτῶν). It is the holy of holy for the Lord.”

¹⁰³ Finlan, *The Background and Content*, 144; Cf. Newton, *The Concept of Purity*, “The blood of Christ which was shed cleanses the impurity which Christ, as *kapporet*, received as a result of the wanton sinful nature of man.”

aligns, further, with the presentation of heroes in terms of sacrifice in other early Jewish texts, including texts that present their figures in terms of Yom Kippur.¹⁰⁴ 4 Maccabees 17:20-22 is often cited in this connection, but there are also OG Dan 3:39-40, 2 Macc 7:32-38, and 4 Macc 6:28-29.¹⁰⁵ Further, the idea of Jesus as having a purifying force was an interpretive trope in early Christianity, as discussed in chapters 2 and 3 of this analysis. Thus, for example, 1 John 1:7 states, “The blood of Jesus his son cleanses us from all sin,” and Heb 9:13-14 states, “If the blood of goats and bulls...sanctified those who have been defiled...how much more will the blood of Christ...purify our conscience from dead works to worship the living God.” Therefore, we see that Paul takes part in an interpretive and theological convention in Rom 3:25. Given that these sources come after Paul’s letters, one might speculate that Paul innovated the motif of Jesus as having a purifying force. On the other hand, this motif might already have been circulating in some form before Paul wrote.

Thus, we see that Paul presents Jesus as a ἱλαστήριον, a “place of atonement by his blood,” in Rom 3:25. In this logic, God has provided a place where sacrificial blood sprinkles, which addresses the situation of the lack of divine presence caused by purity referred to Rom 1:18-32, 3:9, and, most proximately, in 3:23. The model of purification offered here combines the insights of the “expiation” model and the “propitiation” model. Both of these have particular strengths. The expiation model rightly recognizes that sin and impurity, rather than God, are typically the object of atonement. The propitiation model, on the other hand, makes the correct observation that Romans 3 appears to address the wrath of God referred to in Rom 1:18 (cf. 3:5).

¹⁰⁴ On which see Stökl Ben Ezra, *The Impact of Yom Kippur*, 78-334; Jarvis J. Williams, “Cultic Action and Cultic Function in Second Temple Jewish Martyrologies: The Jewish Martyrs as Israel’s Yom Kippur,” in *Sacrifice, Cult, and Atonement in Early Judaism and Christianity: Constituents and Critique* (eds. Henrietta L. Wiley and Christian A. Eberhart; Atlanta: SBL, 2017) 233-63.

¹⁰⁵ Williams, “Cultic Action and Cultic Function,” 233-63.

The propitiation model seeks to affirm both observations. To be sure, impurity, not God, is the object of the atonement. On the other hand, the atonement deals with God's wrath, since the impurity was the reason for God's wrath and movement away from the people.

A further issue to note in relation to Rom 3:24-26 is the coordination of purification with, in Rom 3:24, justification and redemption. The section 3:24-25 states, "They are now justified by his grace as a gift (δικαιούμενοι δωρεὰν τῇ αὐτοῦ χάριτι), through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus (διὰ τῆς ἀπολυτρώσεως τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ), whom God put forward as a place of atonement by his blood..." Paul further defines righteousness and redemption as coming through Jesus' function as a place of atonement. What logic is at play here? The language of redemption is understandable in view of Paul's later connection, in Romans, of sin with enslavement (6:6, 15-23). The term ἀπολύτρωσις could carry the meaning "release from a captive condition,"¹⁰⁶ and this appears to be the meaning in Rom 3:24. Coordinating this with our definition of sin as an impure force, it is not unusual that Paul refers to ἀπολύτρωσις (implied, from sin/impurity) in terms of purification, the removal of sin from the space of people's bodies.

There is, further, the term δικαιούμενοι, which, with all δικ- terms in Paul's letters, has occasioned great debate.¹⁰⁷ In my view, δικαιούμενοι must be understood in terms of Rom 1:18-

¹⁰⁶ So, BDAG, s.v. ἀπολύτρωσις.

¹⁰⁷ Interpreting Paul's righteousness language has been a matter of longstanding interest and disagreement. Interpretations have been grouped into categories of forensic, relational, and ethical/behavioral. Others have sought to problematize these categories (Philip E. Esler, *Galatians* [London: Routledge, 1998] 149-51). J. A. Ziesler argued, in an influential study, that δικαιόω in Paul is used "relationally," and "often with the forensic meaning 'acquit'" (*The Meaning of Righteousness in Paul: A Linguistic and Theological Enquiry* [SNTSMS 20; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972] 1-2). Thus, to place Ziesler in terms of past scholarship, Ziesler combined the relational and the forensic. There is not space here to engage with Ziesler or to explore in detail the different ways Paul uses the language of righteousness. My own reading of δικαιόω in Rom 3:24, 5:1, and 1 Cor 6:11 is influenced by the accounts of Marie-Joseph Lagrange (*Saint Paul Épître Aux Romains* [Paris: Librairie Lecoffre, 1950] 122-33), Ernst Käsemann (*Romans*, 95-96), and Philip Esler (*Galatians*, 141-177; *Conflict and Identity*, 159-68) insofar as I, with them, read the verb as referring to the people actually becoming righteous/just/virtuous. Käsemann (following Barrett, *Romans*, 75-76) grounded this on appeal to the use of δικαιόω to translate the Hiphil causative קָדַשׁ (i.e., LXX Exod 23:7; Deut 25:1; OG Isa 50:8, 53:11).

32 and in terms of the agency of the spirit. In Rom 1:18-32 Paul set up people as under the influence of impurity: due to the influence of impurity, people became ἄδικοι. In Romans 2:15 and 2:29 Paul refers to the agency of the spirit as making people righteous (2:15, 27-29): the person keeps the law, and therefore is just, “by the spirit” (29), on account of which the person will receive praise from God. The problem presented in Rom 1:18-32 and Rom 3:9, and then expressed again in Rom 3:23, is that the people are impure, “under sin,” and thus the spirit cannot dwell in them to make them virtuous. This explains how δικαιούμενοι relates to ἀπολύτρωσις and ἱλαστήριον ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι. The purgation of impurity/sin, through Jesus as a “place where sprinkled blood purifies,” makes the spirit’s dwelling in the person possible and thus makes the person just. This is the manner in which purification is related to redemption and justification.

2.3 Summary and Note about Glory

We noted that in Rom 3:21-26 Paul presents the solution to Rom 1:18-3:20 in terms of purification. According to Romans 1:18-3:20, God, as an expression of wrath, leaves people to the influence of impurity, which results in the degeneration of their bodies and minds. Paul refers to this again in Rom 3:9: all people are “under sin.” In Rom 3:21-26 Paul refers to Jesus as the

Lagrange and Esler noted places in Greek Jewish scripture where the language means “to be righteous” and “to become righteous” (i.e., LXX Gen 38:26; OG Ps 18:10, 50:4; Mic 6:13; Ben Sira 1:21, 7:5, 10:29, 13:22; *Pss. Sol.* 8:27, 9:2). These readings fit the context of 1 Cor 6:9-11, where δικαιόω in the passive occurs alongside ἀπολούω, “to wash,” and ἀγιάζω, “to make holy,” and where Paul refers to the ἄδικοι no longer being ἄδικοι (6:11a: “that is what some of you used to be”). The reading also fits the context of Rom 5:1-11. Cf. Rom 5:18-19, “through the obedience of the one many will be made righteous [διὰ τῆς ὑπακοῆς τοῦ ἐνὸς δίκαιοι κατασταθήσονται οἱ πολλοί].” Käsemann held that δικαιοῦσθαι in 3:24 means “to be made righteous,” but he also affirmed the forensic/declarative sense, which in my view is not suitable to the context. No law court or declaration is envisaged in Rom 3:21-26. Paul is talking about the means by which people in fact become δίκαιος, following their long stint as ἄδικοι under the influence of impurity and without God among them (3:23). More could be said about the language of righteousness in the broader context and in Paul, but this must be left for another analysis.

place of atonement put forward by God to address the situation of impurity. Within this, Rom 3:23 summarizes Rom 1:18-32: “all sinned and lack the glory of God” is a statement about the condition of people, that they are impure, and that God is not with them. But, Jesus cleanses the people of impurity so that the spirit can take up residence in them, so that they may be righteous. As we saw, Jesus as a place of atonement addresses the impurity of the people and also God’s wrath, since impurity was the reason for God’s wrath.

3. Glory in Rom 5:1-11: Confidence in Enjoying Future Divine Presence on the Basis of Justification by Faith

Romans 5:1-11 follows Rom 4:1-25, where Paul supports his point, via appeal to Abraham and Gen 15:6, that God justifies people on the basis of faith rather than works of law (3:30). Romans 5:1-11 is about confidence in view of justification by faith. The passage is, as Michael Wolter notes, “das Gegenstück zu Rom 1,18 – 3,20,” with Rom 3:21-26 as “das Scharnier, dass Röm 1,18 – 3,20 und 5,1-11 zu Gegenstück macht.”¹⁰⁸ Paul envisions a new state brought about by the justification by faith enumerated in Rom 3:21-26, and this present state, and the agency of God in bringing it about, ensures that the people will enjoy future blessing. Paul states in Rom 5:1, “Therefore having been justified by faith (δικαιωθέντες οὖν ἐκ πίστεως εἰρήνην) we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ (ἔχομεν πρὸς τὸν θεὸν διὰ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ).”¹⁰⁹ The justification by faith envisions the purification and the

¹⁰⁸ Wolter, *Römer*, 338.

¹⁰⁹ There is debate over whether Paul uses the verb ἔχωμεν, “let us have peace,” or ἔχομεν, “we have peace,” in Rom 5:2. Many interpreters favor the subjunctive reading in view of the superior manuscript support (Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, 120; Jewett, *Romans*, 344; Longenecker, *Romans*, 549-49n.1) but others favor the indicative reading on the basis of intrinsic probability (Leenhardt, *Romans*, 132; Cranfield *Romans*, 1.257n.1; Käsemann, *Romans*, 132-33; Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 395; Schnabel, *Römer*, 503-04). Michael Wolter (*Rechtfertigung und zukünftiges Heil: Untersuchungen zu Röm 5,1-11* [BZNW 43; Berlin: deGruyter, 1978] 89-95, 135-38; also *Römer*, 316-17n.1) highlights,

indwelling of the spirit in view in Rom 3:21-26. Paul refers explicitly to the spirit within the people in Rom 5:5. On account of the change that has occurred, which makes the people virtuous, they have “peace with God.” The εἰρήνη could be juxtaposed specifically with the reference to God’s wrath in Rom 1:18, but the reference probably has in view more generally the fact that the people, because they are no longer morally impure and dominated by impurity, are no longer God’s “enemies” (ἐχθροί). Reconciliation (καταλλαγή) has taken place, and the people are no longer “helpless” (implied, under sin), “ungodly” (6), and “sinners” (8).

In Rom 5:2 Paul states, “through whom we have access into this grace in [or by] which we stand, (δι’ οὗ καὶ τὴν προσαγωγὴν ἐσχίκαμεν [τῇ πίστει] εἰς τὴν χάριν ταύτην ἐν ᾗ ἐστήκαμεν), and we boast in the hope of the glory of God (καὶ καυχώμεθα ἐπ’ ἐλπίδι τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ).” This is the future hope Paul has in view for the righteous who have been justified by the indwelling of the spirit. Interpreters have usually understood glory in Rom 5:2 in terms of a human quality that the righteous come to possess.¹¹⁰ This is reflected in the translation of the

among other things, that δία + Χριστοῦ formulas in Paul never have hortatory subjunctives; they refer to God’s action and the state of believers resulting from this (Rom 2:16, 5:9, 11, 17, 21); occur amid references to Paul’s self-understanding and activity as an apostle (Rom 1:5, 15:30; 2 Cor 3:4; Gal 1:1) and appear in connection with Paul’s thanksgivings, “through Christ” (Rom 1:8, 7:5, 2 Cor 1:20). Romans 5:2 would thus be the exception. Further, the indicative reading accords with Paul’s argument up to this point and fits within Rom 5:1-11 (Cranfield, *Romans*, 1.257; Käsemann, *Romans*, 132-33; Verlyn D. Verbrugge, “The Grammatical Internal Evidence for EXOMEN in Romans 5:1,” *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 54 [2011]: 569) Daniel B. Wallace (Do Christians Have Peace with God? A Brief Examination of the Textual Problem in Romans 5:1,” n.p. [cited 16 July 2018] Online: <https://bible.org/article/do-christians-have-peace-god-brief-examination-textual-problem-romans-51>) notes that while the manuscript evidence points in favor of the subjunctive, the earliest witness of Rom 5:1, 0220, has the omicron rather than the omega. A classic explanation of the introduction of the subjunctive is that the secretary (16:22) misheard the omicron. This is not a point in favor of the originality of the indicative reading, but it does explain how the subjunctive reading might have appeared. Strictly in view of the manuscript evidence, the subjunctive reading is stronger, but, given the early attestation and not-weak support of the indicative in the manuscript tradition, here the internal evidence is granted more weight (following Wallace, “Do Christians Have Peace with God?” and most commentators).

¹¹⁰ Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, 121 (notes the connection with divine presence but holds that the glory of God is the radiance, “manifested perfection,” taken on in divine presence rather than itself

NRSV, “We boast in our hope of sharing the glory of God,” even though “our” and “sharing” are not present in the Greek text. This reading is based on the connection of Rom 5:1-11 with Rom 8:17-30, where Paul refers to the righteous “being glorified with” (συνδοξασθῶμεν) Jesus. This is, further, thought to correspond to the reference to the human quality with the language of glory in Rom 3:23. In the Adam reading, the glory in each case is connected with the idea of Adam’s original glory.¹¹¹ We have already challenged this connection, and there is nothing specifically Adamic in Rom 5:1-11 that would call our rejection of the Adam reading into question.

The association of Rom 5:1-11 and 8:17-30 is sensible given that they both look forward to a future experience of glory. Moreover, both texts refer to the spirit (5:5; 8:1-30) and to glory in connection with suffering and hope (5:2-5; 8:17-30). On the other hand, the association of glory exclusively with a future human quality misses both the connection of the language with divine presence in Romans and the purity dimension of Paul’s logic. The sense “divine presence” for δόξα τοῦ θεοῦ was already established in relation to Rom 3:23 (and δόξα τοῦ ἀφθάρτου θεοῦ in Rom 1:23). That Paul refers to divine presence again in Rom 5:2 is further suggested given the reference to προσαγωγή in the immediately preceding clause. Προσαγωγή and its cognates have meaning within the discourse of cultic purity and divine presence.¹¹² That this is the case is generally recognized,¹¹³ but interpreters have not allowed the meaning of προσαγωγή to inform

divine presence); Barrett, *Romans*, 103; Käsemann, *Romans*, 133-34; Morris, *Romans*, 220; Longenecker, *Romans*, 560.

¹¹¹ Dunn, *Romans* 1-8; Moo, *Romans*, 302; Wolter, *Römer*, 322; Schnabel, *Römer*, 514; Berry, *Glory in Romans*, 70-73; Jacob, *Conformed to the Image*, 115-17.

¹¹² Wolter, *Römer*, 320-21; Gupta, *Worship that Makes Sense*, 111-16. See Eph 2:18, “Through him both of us have access in one spirit to the father (ἔχομεν τὴν προσαγωγὴν οἱ ἀμφοτέροι ἐν ἑνὶ πνεύματι πρὸς τὸν πατέρα)”; 3:12, “In whom we have boldness and access (ἔχομεν τὴν παρρησίαν καὶ προσαγωγὴν).” Cf. 1 Pet 3:18, “Christ suffered for sins once for all, the righteous for the unrighteous (δίκαιος ὑπὲρ ἀδίκων), to bring you to God (ἵνα ὑμᾶς προσαγάγῃ τῷ θεῷ).”

¹¹³ Barrett, *Romans*, 103; Käsemann, *Romans*, 133, “unhindered access to the sanctuary as the place of God’s presence,” though Käsemann did not connect this with δόξα τοῦ θεοῦ. Moo, *Romans*, 300-301; Haacker, *Römer*, 136; Wolter, *Römer*, 320-21. Dunn and Lohse, *Römer*, 166-67 doubt the cultic

their interpretations of δόξα τοῦ θεοῦ.¹¹⁴ Reading these cultic terms in tandem is suggestive for the logic at play in the passage: that believers currently have access into the sphere of God's grace, and this is anticipatory of access into God's presence at the eschaton.

This confidence, "boasting," in the hope of God's glory, further, entails confidence in the future purity of the people, since, as discussed before, Paul requires purity for the enjoyment of divine presence, both in the present and in the future. Paul refers to this in 1 Thess 3:13, "May he strengthen your hearts in holiness that you may be blameless (εἰς τὸ στηρίζαι ὑμῶν τὰς καρδίας ἀμέμπτους ἐν ἁγιωσύνῃ) before our God and father (ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πατρὸς ἡμῶν) at the coming of our Lord Jesus with all his saints (ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ μετὰ πάντων τῶν ἁγίων αὐτοῦ)."¹¹⁵ In Phil 1:10-11 Paul states, "so that you may be pure and blameless on the day of Christ (εἰλικρινεῖς καὶ ἀπρόσκοποι εἰς ἡμέραν Χριστοῦ), having been filled with the fruit of righteousness (πεπληρωμένοι καρπὸν δικαιοσύνης)." Thus, in Rom 5:2, Paul, referring to "boasting" in the hope of divine presence, indicates that he is confident that God will keep the people pure (εἰλικρινεῖς, ἀπρόσκοποι, ἀμέμπτους) so that they may enjoy God's presence at the eschaton.

Reading the glory of God as divine presence in Rom 5:2 does not rule out the possibility that with the language Paul at the same time refers to the glory humans take on. The parallels

sense of προσαγωγή given that the term has meaning in non-cultic settings. This is true, but that Paul employs the term coupled with other cultic terms in the immediate context, and that Paul employs purity logic through Romans 1-5, point in favor of the cultic association.

¹¹⁴ Though see Leenhardt, *Romans*, 132-33, "Sin had completed a breakdown of relations, Jesus Christ came to restore that harmonious communion which had been interrupted; by Him and by faith the believer finds once more a way of approach to God, and his supreme hope is now to be able to appear in the divine presence and contemplate the divine glory with its ineffable radiation."

¹¹⁵ 1 Thess 5:23: "May the God of peace sanctify you entirely (αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης ἁγιάσαι ὑμᾶς ὁλοτελεῖς), and may your entire self, spirit, soul, and body, be kept blameless at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ (καὶ ὁλόκληρον ὑμῶν τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ καὶ τὸ σῶμα ἀμέμπτως ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ τηρηθεῖν)." Cf. the immediate experience of confidence, paralleling Rom 5:2 (24): "The one who calls you is faithful; he will do this."

between Romans 5 and Romans 8 suggest a connection with human glorification. Further, this with Paul's concept of the eschatological experience of glory: the righteous take on glory in God's glory. We affirmed, in relation to 2 Cor 4:17, that "the eternal weight of glory" refers both to divine presence and to transformation into divine presence. This reading also appears to hold in relation to the "boast in the hope of the glory of God." Therefore, I view Rom 5:2 as referring to both divine presence and the future glorification of the righteous.¹¹⁶

This future glory as divine presence and transformation will be enjoyed, according to Rom 5:3-5, even if the people suffer. Romans 5:3-5 deals with the issue of whether suffering stands counter to the confidence in future glory.¹¹⁷ In fact, Paul says, the suffering strengthens the hope, insofar as suffering produces perseverance and character. Romans 5:5 states, "And hope does not put us to shame, because the love for God has been poured out into our hearts (ὅτι ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκκέχυται ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν) through the holy spirit which was given to us (διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου τοῦ δοθέντος ἡμῖν)." Recent interpretation has strongly favored the view that ἀγάπη τοῦ θεοῦ is "God's love," a subjective genitive.¹¹⁸ The rationale supporting this is that Paul refers to God's love in Rom 5:8 and, further, the passage is about confidence in

¹¹⁶ In Rom 5:2 Paul refers to the glory of God, as divine presence, as a hope. Yet in 2 Cor 3:18 Paul referred to the "glory of the Lord" currently being "beheld" within the community (cf. 4:4; Rom 6:4). Paul indicates no conceptual tension in referring to the glory of God as both experienced among the righteous and at the same time not yet experienced. In this respect the language of glory as divine presence parallels the language of the presence of Christ but differs with the language of the spirit. Paul never indicates any sense in which believers are not already experiencing the spirit. But Paul's refers to Christ presence as experienced (Gal 2:20, "Christ who lives in me"; Rom 8:10) and not yet experienced, since Christ must still "come." A further connection between the language of glory and the language of Christ's presence is that their future forms are experienced at roughly the same time. Believers experience the future glory of God at the coming of Jesus (1 Thess 3:13; 2 Cor 4:14).

¹¹⁷ See parallels with OG Ps 65:10; Nah 1:7; James 1:2-4; 1 Peter 1:6-7, cited in Wolter, *Römer*, 324-26.

¹¹⁸ Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, 125; Leenhardt, *Romans*, 135; Barrett, *Romans*, 105; Käsemann, *Romans*, 135, Cranfield, *Romans*, 1.262-63; Lohse, *Römer*, 168-69; Morris, *Romans*, 221; Moo, *Romans*, 304; Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 398; Wolter, *Römer*, 327. Objective genitive: Origen, *Romans*, 4.9.11-12; Augustine, *Spir. et litt.* 32.56.

future blessing, and God's love is a better source of confidence than people's love for God. I read the phrase as objective genitive, "love for God." This is based on linguistic observations: the "pouring out into our hearts" suggests a connection with the inner disposition (cf. Rom 1:24, "passions of their hearts [ἐπιθυμίας τῶν καρδιῶν αὐτῶν]). The idea is that the love for God, rather than wrong desires, are in the heart. This is, further, based on the logic between Rom 5:5 and 5:6-11: since God saved the people while they were ungodly, how much more likely is God to save them now that, because the spirit is within them, they love God. The subjective genitive reading has its own logic, but the objective genitive reading also has a logic that better accords with Paul reference to pouring out specifically into the heart. The rationale of Rom 5:5 is thus that hope will not put the people to shame, because the spirit of God is within the people's hearts making them love God and thus ensuring that they will be pure and righteous at the eschaton.

Romans 5:6-11 continues on the theme of confidence. Paul appeals to the believer's present state, and God's actions in bringing them to this state, as the basis for confidence in future blessing. The framework of Rom 1:18-3:26 remains active. Paul refers to the people as formerly "helpless," "ungodly," "sinners," and "enemies." This was due to the influence of impurity in their bodies. Paul uses several images in reference to Jesus' death. Paul says, "Christ died for us." Paul says, "How much more, now that we have been justified by his blood (δικαιωθέντες νῦν ἐν τῷ αἵματι αὐτοῦ), will we be saved through him from the wrath of God." Being "justified by his blood" must be understood in terms of the purification logic of Rom 3:21-26: the believers were ἄδικοι, yet they were cleansed by Jesus' blood so that the spirit could indwell them, so that they might be just. The ideas of Rom 1:18-3:26 are also in play with the reference to reconciliation (10-11): the people were enemies of God because of their impurity

and unrighteousness, but Jesus as a place of atonement set God and the righteous on good terms, since the spirit, rather than sin/impurity, is now influencing them.

The reference to being “saved from God’s wrath” in the future is intriguing because it indicates that there is wrath to be addressed that Jesus as a place of atonement did not cover. Wrath continues to apply to those who do not believe.¹¹⁹ The future wrath of God is a regular feature of Paul’s eschatology (1 Thess 5:9; Rom 2:5, 8). To be saved from future wrath, in the context of Romans, signifies not experiencing (2:9) “anguish and distress.” 2 Thessalonians 1 suggests that an additional feature of Paul’s idea of future wrath is separation from divine presence, in accordance with the purity convention. In 2 Thessalonians, the righteous are present when Jesus comes and they are glorified “in him” (1:12). Conversely “those who do not obey the gospel of our Lord Jesus” will “suffer the punishment of eternal destruction, separated from the presence of the Lord and from his powerful glory.”¹²⁰ This is the expression of God’s wrath (1:6-8). This presentation of future wrath corresponds to the portrayal of present wrath as God’s movement away from the people in Rom 1:18-32. The concept of future wrath as “eternal destruction” and separation from divine presence may also be at play in Romans, but this theory remains tentative, since the authenticity of 2 Thessalonians remains an open question.¹²¹

3.1 Summary and Note About Glory

¹¹⁹ The wrath of God might also apply to believers if they do not remain faithful; if they submit themselves again to the influence of sin (Rom 6-8). However, the point of Rom 5:1-11 is that believers will remain steadfast, be pure and righteous at the eschaton, and thus not be subject to God’s future wrath.

¹²⁰ On this reading of 2 Thess 1:9, see Trilling, *Der Zweite Brief an die Thessalonicher*, 59; Fee, *Thessalonians*, 251, 258-60.

¹²¹ In favor of the authenticity of 2 Thessalonians, see Paul Foster, “Who Wrote 2 Thessalonians? A Fresh Look at an Old Problem” *JSNT* 35 (2012): 150-75; Douglas A. Campbell, *Framing Paul: An Epistolary Biography* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2014) 204-53.

Thus, we see that in Rom 5:1-11 Paul refers to the confidence of believers in view of justification by faith. Believers stand in the sphere of grace and this anticipates standing pure in God's presence at the eschaton. We saw that the "glory of God" in Rom 5:2 refers to divine presence, and we indicated the connection of Paul's confidence in divine presence with confidence in maintaining purity. The "glory of God" may also refer, further, to the glory humans take on in divine presence. Paul refers to the spirit's agency in making people righteous. Paul states that believers are confident in having future purity and righteousness in divine presence in view of what God has already done through Jesus and the spirit.

4. Glory in Rom 2:7, 10, 3:7, and 4:20: Glory for the Righteous, and for God

Four further instances of glory language appear in Romans 1-5, two in connection with humans and two in connection with God. Romans 3:7 uses the language of glory as honor to God, in conforming to the use of the vocabulary in Rom 1:21. Paul states, in the voice of the interlocutor, "If through my falsehood God's truthfulness abounds to his glory (εἰ δὲ ἡ ἀλήθεια τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ ψεύσματι ἐπερίσσευσεν εἰς τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ), why am I still being condemned as a sinner (τί ἔτι καὶ γὰρ ὡς ἁμαρτωλὸς κρίνομαι)?" The phrase εἰς τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ is the same phrase used in 1 Cor 10:31, 2 Cor 4:15, Phil 1:11, and 2:11 (cf. 2 Cor 1:20, 8:19). Further, the verb περισσεύω occurs in relation to a word for praise here and in 2 Cor 4:15 and 9:12 (cf. Col 2:7). Romans 3:7-8 is an attempt on the part of the interlocutor to catch Paul in a fault of reasoning. In 3:4, Paul had imagined God receiving glory through showing faithfulness amid the lack of the faithfulness of Jews. From this the interlocutor infers that sinners should be applauded rather than condemned, since this results in further praise for God. The interlocutor concludes, "Why not say...Let us do evil, that good may come?" It appears certain people had

attributed this to Paul (“As some say that we say...”). Paul summarily rejects this inference: “Their condemnation is deserved.”

The language of glory appears, also, in Rom 4:20, amid discussion of Abraham’s righteousness. Paul states, “With respect to the promise of God (εἰς δὲ τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ θεοῦ), he did not doubt in unbelief (οὐ διεκρίθη τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ), but was strengthened in faith as he gave glory to God (ἀλλ’ ἐνεδυναμώθη τῇ πίστει δούς δόξαν τῷ θεῷ).” This is the only occurrence of the scriptural idiom δίδωμι + δόξαν + dative noun for God in Paul’s letters.¹²² The participle appears to signal attendant circumstance: Abraham was strengthened in faith as he gave glory to God. Paul does not specify by what means Abraham glorified God. It was perhaps through sacrifice,¹²³ through means of obedience and confession, or these things combined.¹²⁴ Romans 4:20 puts forward Abraham as a person who differs from the people of Rom 1:21, who did not glorify or give thanks to God. The dynamic of divine benefaction is clear in Romans 4 in view of Paul’s use of the language of glory and the references to χάρις in Rom 4:4 and 16. Abraham’s glory to God is in response to divine benefaction.

Two further instances of the language of glory are in Rom 2:7 and 10. These instances appear amid Paul’s references to eschatological judgment of one’s good or bad deeds. Paul states, “To those who by the endurance of good work seek eternal life (τοῖς μὲν καθ’ ὑπομονὴν ἔργου ἀγαθοῦ ζητοῦσιν ζωὴν αἰώνιον), there will be glory and honor and immortality (δόξαν καὶ τιμὴν καὶ ἀφθαρσίαν)...glory and honor and peace for all who do good (δόξα δὲ καὶ τιμὴ καὶ

¹²² See chapter 2 section 1.2.

¹²³ *Apoc. Mos.* 4:3, “we will give glory and sacrifice to God” (δώσωμεν δόξαν καὶ θυσίαν τῷ θεῷ).”

¹²⁴ Philo, *Spec.* 1.224: the person who receives God’s benefits is “bound to requite God, who has been the pilot of his voyage, who has bestowed upon him untroubled salvation and unalloyed benefits, and, in short, all sorts of blessings unmingled with any evil, with hymns, and songs, and prayers, and also with sacrifices, and all other imaginable tokens of gratitude in a holy manner; all which things taken together have received the one comprehensive name of praise.”

εἰρήνη παντὶ τῷ ἐργαζομένῳ τὸ ἀγαθόν).” Proposals about the meaning of glory in these verses vary, and they often accord with how interpreters read glory in Rom 3:23, 5:2, and 8:17-30. Proposals include that the glory means honor, divine quality of life, divine presence, transformation, honor and corruption, and power associated with status.¹²⁵ Many interpreters are content to leave the referent of the language unspecified.¹²⁶ The references to glory in Rom 2:7 and 10 do not appear to connect to the use of the language of glory in Rom 1:23, 3:23, and 5:2. Paul couples the language, in Rom 2:7 and 10, with “immortality,” “honor,” and “peace,” and glory is not associated with these terms in the other contexts.¹²⁷ In addition, the importance of the references to glory in Romans 2 should not be overstated. Paul refers to eschatological rewards and punishment in passing on the way towards the main point of Romans 2:5-11, that is, that “God shows no partiality.” Therefore, leaving the meaning of the terms unspecified and simply understanding the terms together as referring to “diejenigen eschatischen Heilsgüter, auf die jeder aus ist, der gute Werke tut,”¹²⁸ is an attractive option.

Nevertheless, we may offer some further perspective on the semantic contribution of the individual terms. Honor, τιμή, refers to the good status those who do good will enjoy at the eschaton. Immortality refers to the unending and incorruptible nature of eschatological life, and peace refers to its peaceful conditions. Δόξα may function simply as a rough synonym of τιμή, as

¹²⁵ Honor: Dunn, *Romans* 1-8, 65. Divine quality of life: Sprinkle, “The Afterlife in Romans,” 224; cf. Berry, *Glory in Romans*, 37. Divine presence: Origen, *Romans*, 2.5.4-5; Grindheim, 462-65. Transformation: Ambrosiaster, in *Ambrosiaster’s Commentary on the Pauline Epistles: Romans* (trans. Theodor S. de Bruyn; Atlanta: SBL, 2017) 42. Honor and incorruption: Blackwell, “Immortal Glory,” 298-99. Power associated with status: Jacob, *Conformed to the Image*, 84, 93-99, 112-17.

¹²⁶ Cranfield, *Romans*, 1.147; Moo, *Romans*, 137n7; Lohse, *Römer*, 100; Wolter, *Römer*, 175.

¹²⁷ Also, Paul does not work within the framework of loss of divine presence with reference to glory in Rom 2:7 and 10 that is apparent with reference to glory in Rom 1:23, 3:23, and 5:2. Paul simply refers to some rewards and punishments as the results of good and bad living.

¹²⁸ Wolter, *Römer*, 175; cf. Lohse, *Römer*, 100.

it does in other settings in ancient literature.¹²⁹ However, elsewhere Paul indicates the connection of δόξα with radiance in association with eschatological life (2 Cor 3:18; 1 Cor 15:40-43). Thus, that δόξα in Rom 2:7 and 10 refers to radiance, coupled with references to the honor, immortality, and peace of eschatological blessing, is slightly favored here.

Certain recent interpreters hold that in Romans 2:7 and 10, with the language of glory, honor and immortality, Paul engages conventions related to the Roman concern for honor.¹³⁰ Halvor Moxnes holds that in Romans 2 Paul deals with a “situation of competition for honour” and that Paul aims to show that God is the “significant other, in whose eyes approval is sought.”¹³¹ Robert Jewett reads Romans 2 in similar manner: according to Jewett, the references to glory in Rom 2:7 and 10 are anticipatory of Rom 3:23, where Paul states that all fall short of the “transcendent standard of honor” and thus do not receive God’s approval.¹³² These readings appropriately draw attention to the frequent coupling of the terms glory and honor in texts that discuss sociological status. However, that Paul seeks to engage with the concern for honor in the way stipulated in these readings goes beyond the discursive horizon of the text. Paul does not say that future, eschatological glory is better than mundane honor and status within the group, nor does he state, in the immediate context, that the opinion of God is more important than the opinion of humans (though cf. Rom 2:29). Other early Christian texts, including texts in Paul’s letters, make these and similar points,¹³³ but in this passage Paul works with a framework of

¹²⁹ Chapter 2 section 1.2.

¹³⁰ Moxnes, “Honour and Righteousness in Romans,” 61-77; Jewett, *Romans*, 204-05, 209; Harrison, “Paul and Ancient Civic Ethics,” 107-08; cf. Idem., “Paul and the Roman Ideal of Glory,” 203-05.

¹³¹ Moxnes, “Honour and Righteousness in Romans,” 68-69.

¹³² Jewett, *Romans*, 204-05, 209; cf. Harrison, “Paul and Ancient Civic Ethics,” 107-08.

¹³³ 1 Thess 2:4, 1 Cor 4:3-4. Cf Rom 14:18, where Paul affirms the importance of human approval. On the broader phenomenon, including with early Christian sources, see chapter two.

eschatological reward and punishment that is not oriented towards challenging norms about honor and status.

4.1 Summary and Note about Glory

We see, then, that Paul refers to glory as radiance as an eschatological reward, in passing, as he states that God does not judge on the basis of ethnicity. The use of the language of glory in Rom 2:7 and 10 is not directly connected to the use of glory in Rom 1:23, 3:23, and 5:2: in Rom 1:18-32, 3:21-26, 5:1-11, glory is the presence of God that people gave up and look forward to, whereas in Rom 2:7 and 10 glory is one of several eschatological rewards. In Rom 3:7 Paul uses the language of glory in connection with praise to God on account of God's faithfulness amid human faithlessness. Paul rejects the premise that "we should do evil, that good may come," but not the idea that God's being true should earn him praise. In Rom 4:20, Paul presents Abraham giving glory to God as the proper response to God's benefaction. The references to glory to God in these settings connect to other settings where Paul refers to praise due to God on account of benefaction.

5. Conclusion

In drawing the discussion to a close we may make concluding observations about the findings of the analysis. We saw that Rom 1:18-32 constitutes an example of purity discourse in which Paul frames the general human condition in terms of the loss of divine presence on account of impurity and the devolution of human bodies and minds that occurs as a result of this. Paul refers to this again in Rom 3:21-26 and puts forward the solution as Jesus as a place of atonement that purifies the people and make divine presence possible. In Rom 5:1-11 Paul refers

to the purifying agency of Jesus again and notes the presence of the spirit within the people, which allows them to be virtuous. In these settings Paul uses the language of glory to mean divine presence. The “the glory of the immortal God” in Rom 1:23 is the presence of God that people give up for the sake of images. Romans 3:23 refers to the presence of God that people lack due to impurity, and Rom 5:2 refers to the hope of being pure and standing in God’s presence at the eschaton.

We saw, in addition, that Paul uses glory as praise and honor to God. The people of Romans 1 fail to glorify and praise God, which means they did not appropriately honor God in return for God’s benefaction. Paul also refers to praise to God with the language of glory in Rom 3:7 and 4:20, where God gains glory through showing faithfulness and where Abraham gives glory to God on account of benefaction. We noted, further, that glory in Rom 5:2 may, in addition to referring to divine presence, also refer to transformation into glory in the future. We also observed that glory in Rom 2:7 and 10 appears to refer to radiance. Paul refers to this in passing amid talking about God’s impartial judgment. Our account of glory indicates that Paul’s use of the language in Romans 1-5 in many cases aligns with how it appears in the other letters. Paul use glory to refer to divine presence, as in 1 Thess 2:12, 2 Cor 3:18a, 4:4, and 4:17. Moreover, these uses of the language are conceptually associated with purity. We also saw the connection of glory as praise with the ideas of divine patronage, as in many settings in the other letters. On the other hand, Romans 1-5 does not use the language of glory as esteem within the community, in contrast with Paul’s use of the language in other letters (i.e., 1 Thess 2:6; 1 Cor 12:26).

In Romans 1-5 Paul refers to the agency of God, Jesus, and the spirit in reversing the situation of Rom 1:18-32. The people become ἄδικοι due to the influence of impurity within

their bodies. The solution to this is God's putting forward Jesus as a place of atonement so that people may be purified and enjoy divine presence. The spirit dwelling inside the righteous is the means by which the people may be just in the present. The purity logic that appears in Romans 1-5 continues to appear in Romans 6-8. The next chapter considers the remaining instances of the language of glory in Romans, in Romans 6-16. I show that Paul uses glory in Romans 6-8 to refer to divine presence and transformation into a glorious form in divine presence. In Romans 8 Paul envisions the complete reversal of Rom 1:18-32. The bodies of the righteous are glorified in divine presence, in reversal of the "dishonoring of bodies" due to the loss of divine presence in Rom 1:24. I treat these and other issues in the next chapter.

5. Glory in Romans 6-16

In the previous chapter we saw that Paul set up the general human condition in terms of the loss of divine presence and the descent into ἀσέβεια and ἀδικία that occurred as a result of this. We noted that Paul sets up the influence of impurity in the bodies of humans: as Rom 1:24 reports, “God handed them over,” that is, God left the people, “to impurity (εἰς ἀκαθαρσίαν), to the dishonoring of their bodies among themselves (τοῦ ἀτιμάζεσθαι τὰ σώματα αὐτῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς).” The influence of impurity in people’s bodies led to degraded bodies and minds, so that the people were “filled with unrighteousness” and other vices (1:29-32). Paul refers to this as “under sin” in 3:9; the term ἁμαρτία here is used to refer to the miasma referred to in Rom 1:24. The solution to the situation of Rom 1:18-32 is God’s putting forward Jesus as a place of atonement, a “placed where purifying blood sprinkles,” in Rom 3:21-26, which removes sin from its place of dominance within people. Because of purification, the spirit may now reside in people, in their “hearts” (5:5), and thus the people may be δίκαιος.

This framework of ideas remains active in Romans 6-8 and is necessary to keep in view in understanding what Paul says there. This implicates the language of glory in that setting, as becomes clear in this analysis. In this chapter we continue the investigation of Romans by examining the language of glory in chapter 6-16. The language appears in these chapters fourteen times. I investigate the language in Romans 6-8 and shows its connections with divine presence and transformation. I discuss the three occurrences of glory in Romans 9, which refer to glory promise to Israel (9:4) and the glory in store for the righteous (9:23). I discuss Rom 11:13 with its reference to glorifying the ministry of Paul. And I also consider the references to glory

for God at the end of Romans 11, in Romans 15 and in 16:27. In these settings Paul associates glory with divine presence, purity, transformation, divine patronage, and appearance.

1. Glory in Romans 6-8: Divine Presence Making New Life Possible; Transformation into Glory, Reversing Rom 1:18-32

Romans 6-8 considers life after justification by faith (defined as purification of sin and the indwelling of the spirit) and before final bodily transformation in divine presence. Romans 6:1 follows Rom 5:12-21, where Paul provides an illustration in support of the idea, referenced in Rom 5:11, that one person can have relevance for many (“through our Lord Jesus Christ”).¹ The account of grace in Rom 5:12-21, and particularly the statement of Rom 5:20, “where sin increased, grace abounded all the more,” occasions the question of 6:1: “What are we to say? Should we continue in sin in order that grace might abound?” Paul does not appeal again to the image of Jesus as a purifying agent in Rom 6:2-14; rather, he employs the metaphor of baptism as a means of uniting believers with Christ’s burial and resurrection life. Paul states, “Do you know that all of us who have baptized into Christ Jesus were baptized into his death? Therefore we have been buried with him by baptism unto death (συνετάφημεν οὖν αὐτῷ διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος εἰς τὸν θάνατον), so that, just as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the father (ἵνα ὥσπερ ἠγέρθη Χριστὸς ἐκ νεκρῶν διὰ τῆς δόξης τοῦ πατρὸς), we too might walk in newness of life (οὕτως καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐν καινότητι ζωῆς περιπατήσωμεν).” The baptism image has the association of purification and entrance into the community (1 Cor 6:9-11), but Paul does not

¹ Stowers, *Rereading of Romans*, 253, “The example of 5:12-20 supports 5:1-11 by showing how Christ, faithfully adapting himself to the situation of the ungodly affected ‘all’ and the ‘many.’” Gieniusz discusses the relevance of Adam in Rom 5:12-21 (*Romans* 8:18-30, 157): “His [Adam’s] instrumental agency seems to be mentioned only in order to provide a rhetorical spring-board for the presentation of Christ’s salvific activity.”

highlight these connections here. The “glory of the father,” in my reading, refers to the presence of God that raised Jesus and now dwells in believers, which gives them “newness of life,” that is, a disposition towards the good.² There is an identification of the glory as divine presence, here, with the spirit. This has not been widely recognized: interpreters tend to read δόξα here as a synonym of δύναμις, in view of the putative meaning of “power” for glory that developed in Greek Jewish scriptures and in view of 1 Cor 6:14. However, this misses the developed theme of divine presence within Romans and the motif of the indwelling spirit. That this motif is present in Rom 6:4 is clear from the parallel with Rom 8:11: in the later setting, the spirit is the one who raised Jesus and who gives life (ζωή, 6:4; ζωοποιέω, 8:11) to the body.³ Thus, in Rom 6:4 Paul refers to divine presence as the agent of Christ’s resurrection and the means of newness of life of the believers.⁴

Romans 6 continues to refer to the ongoing potential influence of the impure force, while Paul makes appeals (6:13: “no longer present your limbs to sin as instruments of injustice, but present yourself to God, as those brought from death to life”) and expresses confidence (6:14: “sin will not rule over you, because you are not under law but under grace”). The reference to the law in Rom 6:14 anticipates the discussion of the law in Romans 7. Romans 7:1-6 refers to being “discharged from the law” and 7:7-25 uses speech in character to highlight that the person who

² Black (*Romans*, 94) and Wolter (*Römer*, 374) read διὰ τῆς δόξης τοῦ πατρός as signaling attendant circumstance rather than agency, but this misses the dynamic of divine presence as the means of creating new life, and, from the linguistic perspective, the use of διὰ in 1 Cor 6:14 and Rom 8:11, in connection with resurrection, where the preposition signals means.

³ 8:11: “If the spirit of him who raised Jesus from the dead dwells in you (ὁ ἐγείρας Χριστὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν ζωοποιήσῃ καὶ τὰ θνητὰ σώματα ὑμῶν διὰ τοῦ ἐνοικοῦντος αὐτοῦ πνεύματος ἐν ὑμῖν), he who raised Jesus from the dead will also give life to your mortal bodies through his spirit that dwells in you (ὁ ἐγείρας Χριστὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν ζωοποιήσῃ καὶ τὰ θνητὰ σώματα ὑμῶν διὰ τοῦ ἐνοικοῦντος αὐτοῦ πνεύματος ἐν ὑμῖν).” See also 7:6; ‘in newness of the spirit’ (ἐν καινότητι πνεύματος) parallels “in newness of life” (ἐν καινότητι ζωῆς) of 6:4.

⁴ For another setting where spirit and glory as divine presence are closely associated, see 2 Cor 3:18: “beholding the glory of the Lord, transformed...from the Lord, the spirit.”

seeks to do the law without the spirit of life cannot do it, because of the “sin that dwells within me.”⁵ Against certain interpreters, there is nothing particularly Adamic about Romans 7.⁶ Adam is attributed with the entrance of sin into the world in Rom 5:12: a status that sets him at the same level as the people who performed idolatry and exchanged God’s glory in Rom 1:18-32. However, the framework of sin’s influence in people’s bodies does not derive from Genesis or an interpretive motif related to Adam, and there is no reason to suppose that Adam is in view in Rom 7:7-25. Paul does not refer to Adam, and the idea of Adam in Rom 7:7-13 does not align with the scheme Paul sets up explicitly in relation to Adam in Rom 5:12-21.⁷ Paul never refers to Adam’s interest in keeping the law. In my reading, the “I” of 7:14-25 is the any person who seeks to be just by the law without the spirit.⁸ The discussion of the inability of the person without justification leads to the turn, in Romans 8, to reference to God’s agency in purifying people and the indwelling of the spirit. Paul states, “There is therefore now no condemnation for those who are in Christ Jesus,” thus contrasting the state of the non-justified of Rom 7:14-25 with the justified. Paul continues (8:2-4)

For the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus has set you free from the law of sin and

death (ὁ γὰρ νόμος τοῦ πνεύματος τῆς ζωῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ ἠλευθέρωσέν σε ἀπὸ τοῦ

⁵ Classic studies are Werner G. Kümmel, *Römer 7 und die Bekehrung des Paulus* (UNT 17; Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1929); Jan Lambrecht, *The Wretched “I” and its Liberation: Paul in Romans 7 and 8* (Louvain: Peeters/Eerdmans, 1992). I agree with Stowers, *Rereading of Romans*, 260-84; Wasserman, *The Death of the Soul in Romans 7* (WUNT II/256; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008) 117-48; Rodríguez, *If You Call Yourself a Jew*, 125-46, on the use of speech in character and the idea that it is a person pre-justification by faith, but I would not limit the identification of the person to a gentile proselyte.

⁶ Stanislas Lyonnet, “L’histoire du salut selon le chapitre VII de l’Épître aux Romains,” *Biblica* 43 (1962): 133; Dunn, *Romans 1-8*, 382-83.

⁷ On which see Lambrecht, *The Wretched “I”*, 62-64. Romans 5:12 says that through Adam sin came into the world. The figure of Rom 7:7-13 is already under the influence of sin.

⁸ Thus, Stowers, *Rereading of Romans*, 260-84; Wassermann, *The Death of the Soul*, 117-48; Rodríguez, *If You Call Yourself a Jew*, 130-46, except they limit the referent to the gentile proselyte. I would connect Rom 7:7-25 with Rom 3:20, “through the works of the law no flesh will be justified, for through the law comes knowledge of sin,” with its immediately preceding reference to “we have already charged that all, both Jews and Greeks, are under sin.”

νόμου τῆς ἁμαρτίας καὶ τοῦ θανάτου). For the law, [being] ineffectual wherein it was weak because of the flesh (Τὸ γὰρ ἀδύνατον τοῦ νόμου ἐν ᾧ ἡσθένει διὰ τῆς σαρκός), God, by sending his own son in the form of sinful flesh and as a purification offering (ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἑαυτοῦ υἱὸν πέμψας ἐν ὁμοιώματι σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας καὶ περὶ ἁμαρτίας), condemned sin in the flesh (κατέκρινεν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ἐν τῇ σαρκί).

The “law of the spirit of life” appears to refer to the exercised authority of the spirit of life in people, which sets them free from the authority of sin.⁹ In v. 3a the reference to the law refers to the code of conduct that might make the person righteous. The law was not able to do this, because of the influence of impurity in the person. Romans 8:3a is roughly a restatement of Rom 3:20: “No human being will be justified in his sight by works of the law (ἐξ ἔργων νόμου οὐ δικαιωθήσεται πᾶσα σὰρξ ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ), for through the law comes knowledge of sin”; that is, the law cannot justify, it can only indicate that the people are not just, because sin is dominating people. In my reading, Paul states in Rom 6:3b, “God, by sending his own son in the likeness of sinful flesh and as a purification offering, condemned sin in the flesh.” This presents Jesus, as in Rom 3:25, as a sacrificial means of purification. Interpreters have not understood Rom 8:3 as referring to a purification offering, though they have affirmed the connection of Rom 8:3 with

⁹ Thus, Leenhardt, *Romans*, 201; Cranfield, *Romans*, 1.373-76; Käsemann, *Romans*, 213-15; Wolter, *Römer*, 473-74. This is a metaphorical reading of the reference to νόμος given that to read this as a reference to the law does not align with the logic of the passage. The references to the law in Rom 8:2 build upon the references to the law in Rom 7:7-25, which accounts for the “lumbering phrase” (Jewett, *Romans*, 481). An alternate view is that the “law of the spirit of life” and the “law of sin and death” both refer to the law; the reference is to the law in its corrupted and restored form (Dunn, *Romans 1-8*, 416-18). This has the merit of holding that the same referent of law is in view between 8:2a-b with 8:3, and this accords with the meaning of law elsewhere in the letter. However, this reading does not align with Paul’s logic, since in Rom 8:3 Paul says that the law is unable to set people free, which is what Paul says the law does in Rom 8:2a. Thus, I favor the reading of Leenhardt and others. On all accounts the language is difficult to interpret.

the biblical חטאת.¹⁰ These readers have held that 8:3 refers to a “sin offering” or, in the case of Käsemann, “expiatory sacrifice.” Milgrom established that the חטאת and thus its corresponding Greek term, *περὶ ἁμαρτίας*, with related formulations, should be understood as a “purification offering,” since it carries the sense of cleansing and purging.¹¹ The term *περὶ ἁμαρτίας* appears in Rom 8:3 in connection with God’s sending Jesus in the form of sinful flesh, and as a means by which sin is “condemned in the flesh.” That the logic of justification by faith is present in Rom 8:3, with its reference to the purification offering, is further indicated by Rom 8:4, “so that the just requirement of the law might be fulfilled in us who walk not according to the flesh but according to the spirit.” The logic is, as it was in Rom 3:24-25, that cleansing is necessary so that the spirit may dwell in the people, so that the people may be just.

Within this the reference to “condemned sin in the flesh” and Jesus “in the form of sinful flesh” must be considered. The verb κατακρίνω refers to both the sentencing and the execution of the sentencing.¹² The sentencing implied is removal: as Origen detected, “After this sacrifice of Christ’s flesh, which was offered for and condemned sin, i.e., put sin to flight and took it away.”¹³ The reference to “in the flesh” refers to the place where the sin was condemned. The

¹⁰ Käsemann, *Romans*, 214-16; Wright, *The Climax of the Covenant* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991) 219-25; Moo, *Romans*, 480; Bell, “Sacrifice and Christology,” 5-8; Finlan, *The Background and Content*, 114-16.

¹¹ Milgrom, *Studies in Cultic Theology*, 67-69; see also Anderson, “Sacrifice and Sacrificial Offerings (OT),” 879-80. On the use of *περὶ ἁμαρτίας* for the purification offering, see Wright, *The Climax of the Covenant*, 221-22. I.e., LXX Lev 16:3, “Thus will Aaron come into the holy place; with a young bull from the herd as a purification offering and a ram as a burnt offering (ἐν μόσχῳ ἐκ βοῶν περὶ ἁμαρτίας καὶ κριὸν εἰς ὀλοκαύτωμα);” 16:27, “and the bull which is a purification offering and the goat which is a purification offering (καὶ τὸν μόσχον τὸν περὶ τῆς ἁμαρτίας καὶ τὸν χίμαρον τὸν περὶ τῆς ἁμαρτίας), whose blood is brought in to atone in the holy place (ὧν τὸ αἷμα εἰσηνέχθη ἐξιλάσασθαι ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ);” OG Ps 39:7, “Sacrifice and offering you did not want (θυσίαν καὶ προσφορὰν οὐκ ἠθέλησας)...whole burnt offerings and purification offering you did request (ὀλοκαύτωμα καὶ περὶ ἁμαρτίας οὐκ ᾔτησας).”

¹² TDNT s.v. κατακρίνω; cf. 2 Pet 2:16; Cranfield, *Romans*, 1.282-83; Wolter, *Römer*, 479.

¹³ *Romans*, 6.12.5. (This aligns, further, with the necessity of removal of impurity for the indwelling of the spirit referenced in Rom 8:9-11.) Origen connects Rom 8:3 with Heb 7:27. Origen

idea that this refers to Jesus' flesh, the view taken in many settings,¹⁴ aligns with the immediately preceding clause but does not accord with the references to flesh in the rest of the passage. The image is of Jesus's death as a purification offering removing the sin that was in the flesh away from the flesh. The flesh (as body; cf. Rom 7:13) is not thereby transformed; it remains dishonored (1:24; "the body is dead because of sin," 8:10) and open to the influence of sin.¹⁵ But, the removal of the sin means that the person may be indwelt by the spirit so that the "just requirement of the law might be fulfilled in us."

This reading of *περὶ ἁμαρτίας* is strengthened, further, given the relation of the construction to other constructions Paul uses in reference to Jesus' death. As Michael Wolter notes, in comparable formulas Paul always uses the prepositions *ὑπέρ* + genitive (1 Cor 15:3; 2 Cor 5:21; Gal 1:4) and *διὰ* + accusative (Rom 4:25). Further, in these texts, in contrast to Rom 8:3, Paul always uses the plural *ἁμαρτῶν* or *παραπτώματα*, rather than the singular *ἁμαρτίας*. Michael Wolter concludes, "Beides macht es sehr wahrscheinlich, dass bei *περὶ ἁμαρτίας* in Röm 8:3 der opferkultische Gebrauch dieses Ausdrucks in der Septuaginta mitgehört werden will."¹⁶

states, "All the Scriptures testify to the fact that Christ became a sacrifice for the sake of sin and was offered for the cleansing of sin."

¹⁴ Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, 194; Moo, *Romans*, 480; Bell, "Sacrifice and Christology," 207. The tendency to view this as referring to Jesus' flesh may reflect the lack of recognition that sin dwells in the flesh/body.

¹⁵ On the flesh, interpreters have often sought to pose a separation between the *σάρξ* and the *σῶμα* in view of the idea that Paul did not view the body as inherently evil (thus the idea of *σάρξ* as a "fallen nature," Cranfield, *Romans*, 1.337; NIV; Jewett, *Romans*, 483, *σάρξ* "functions as a universal symbol for the crippling competition for honor that distorts every human endeavor"). On which see Craig Keener, *Romans: A New Covenant Commentary* (Cambridge: Lutterworth, 2009) 95-7. In my view, Paul does not view the body as inherently evil but as currently dishonored (1:24), which is the reason that transformation in divine presence is necessary. Romans 8:13 is counter to the sentiment of a distinction between the *σάρξ* and the *σῶμα*: "If you live according to the flesh you are going to die (*εἰ γὰρ κατὰ σάρκα ζῆτε μέλλετε ἀποθνήσκειν*), but if by the spirit you put to death the deeds of the body you will live (*εἰ δὲ πνεύματι τὰς πράξεις τοῦ σώματος θανατοῦτε ζήσεσθε*)."¹ 1 Cor 6:16, "Do you not know that the one united to a prostitute is one body with her (*τῇ πόρνῃ ἐν σῶμά ἐστιν*)? For it is said, 'The two shall become one flesh (*οἱ δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν*).'"

¹⁶ Wolter, *Römer*, 478-79.

This provides further reason to understand the *περὶ ἁμαρτίας* as a purification offering. Certain interpreters object to the connection because, in their view, the context does not provide enough clues to signal the connection with the biblical sacrifice.¹⁷ This is due to the lack of recognition of the dynamics of purity and divine presence at work in Romans. Our reading has shown the purity logic at work in the letter and that appears in Rom 8:1-4: the purification, through removing “sin in the flesh,” makes the indwelling of the spirit possible, and this results in the eschatological tension in view in Rom 8:4-17.

This tension is expressed in terms of the need to “walk according to the spirit” rather than walking “according to the flesh.” In Rom 8:18 Paul uses the image of people “in the flesh,” which means people in whom sin dwells; this is signaled by the definition of people “in the spirit” as people in which “the spirit of God dwells” (8:9). Paul distinguishes between “those who are in flesh” and “you” (ὁμεῖς), the people Paul addresses. These people are indwelt by the spirit because sin has been removed from them. Paul says, “Anyone who does not have the spirit of Christ does not belong to him.” These are the impure people who remain “in the flesh,” who have not been justified. Paul says in Rom 8:11, “If the spirit of him who raised you from the dead dwells in you, he who raised Christ from the dead will give life to your mortal bodies through his spirit who dwells in you.” This refers to the current giving of life to the (10) “dead body,” the “mortal body.” This life is the pneumatic life by which virtue becomes possible (cf. 6:4; 7:6). Romans 8:12-17 has indicative statements but is hortatory in tone.¹⁸ Paul refers to “adoption” for the first time in this section, in reference to the spirit as the “spirit of adoption” (8:14). This appears to allude to Romans 4 and the discussion of Abraham; Paul refers to the

¹⁷ Cranfield, *Romans*, 1.382; Barrett, *Romans*, 156; Morris, *Romans*, 303; A. Andrew Das, *Paul, the Law, and the Covenant* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2001) 126-28; Jewett, *Romans*, 484.

¹⁸ Noted in Käsemann, *Romans*, 225-29; see particularly 8:13, 17.

spirit as the means of turning once impure and unjust people into “Abraham’s seed” (4:13; cf. Gal 3:29-4:7), that is, people who are righteous like Abraham. The process of transformation into children has already started; they are “children of God” (14, 17); but it has not been completed. Paul’s comments call for the final transformation of the σῶμα, which Paul refers to in Rom 8:17-30 with the language of glory, adoption, and redemption.

Paul states in Rom 8:17, “We are children of God, and if children, then heirs (εἰ δὲ τέκνα, καὶ κληρονόμοι), heirs of God and fellow heirs with Christ (κληρονόμοι μὲν θεοῦ, συγκληρονόμοι δὲ Χριστοῦ), provided we suffer with him so that we may also be glorified with him (εἴπερ συμπάσχομεν ἵνα καὶ συνδοξασθῶμεν).” I read the εἴπερ as conditional, in view of the hortatory dimension of the section.¹⁹ The inheritance is the glorification, suggested by the parallel συν- compounds. The verb συνδοξασθῶμεν means “to be glorified with him.” The verb carries the sense of honoring and transformation.²⁰ The specific object of the glorification is the σῶμα. Romans 8:17 stands as the counterpart to Rom 1:24, God “handed them over to impurity, to the dishonoring of the bodies among themselves (τοῦ ἀτιμάζεσθαι τὰ σώματα αὐτῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς).” The bodies were dishonored under the influence of impurity; Paul envisions the cleansing of impurity, partially reversing the situation, but the transformation of the body has still to occur; the honoring of bodies is envisioned in 8:17-30. This reading of glorification parallels, further, Phil 3:20-21, “Christ Jesus, who will transform the body of our shame that it

¹⁹ With Käsemann; Dunn, *Romans 1-8*; Jacob, *Conformed to the Image*, 222. The causal reading, “since you suffer with him,” is based on the observation that Paul refers to actual suffering in the immediately following verse (also the use of the word in Rom 3:30a; 8:9b, cited in Wolter, *Römer*, 501). However, 8:17 is positioned at the end of a hortatory section (see 8:13). The connection of Rom 8:13 with 8:17 suggests that the “suffering” Paul has in view relates to the struggle with the flesh.

²⁰ Against Moxnes, who reads this as an honoring without reference to transformation. Paul’s references to glorification consistently use the terminology of transformation (2 Cor 3:18; Phil 3:20-21; Rom 8:29-30, “conformed to the image of his son” parallels “glorified.”

may be conformed to the body of his glory (ὅς μετασχηματίσει τὸ σῶμα τῆς ταπεινώσεως ἡμῶν σύμμορφον τῷ σώματι τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ).”

The conceptual connection between honor and virtue, discussed in chapter 2, must be mentioned again here.²¹ Honor and virtue were associated: honor derived from virtue, just as shame derived from vice,²² and this association is at play in Romans 8. Thus, in my reading, to be glorified with Christ means to take on an honorable, virtuous form that corresponds to Christ’s form. There is, further, the connection with radiance: Paul indicates the connection of glory with radiance in eschatological context in 2 Cor 3:18 and 1 Cor 15:40-43. Therefore, when Paul says, “so that we may be glorified with Christ,” he refers to taking on the honorable, radiant bodily form that corresponds to Christ’s body.²³ There is the conceptual connection with suffering in Rom 8:17, which parallels Paul’s reference to glory and suffering in Rom 5:1-5 and 2 Cor 4:17. This may be connected to the idea of honor as gained through great effort and endurance.²⁴ Paul refers to suffering and glory again in 8:18: “I consider the sufferings of the present time (λογίζομαι γὰρ ὅτι οὐκ ἄξια τὰ παθήματα τοῦ νῦν καιροῦ) are not worth comparing with the glory to be revealed for us (πρὸς τὴν μέλλουσαν δόξαν ἀποκαλυφθῆναι εἰς ἡμᾶς).”²⁵ This text closely parallels 2 Cor 4:17, “For this slight momentary suffering is preparing for us an

²¹ See chapter 2 section 2.1.

²² Barton, *Roman Honor*, 36-53. Sallust, *Jug.* 4.5, “When they beheld the images of their ancestors, their spirits were violently enflamed to virtue.” *Cat.* 85.23: “Caesar yearned for a high command, an army and a new war where his virtue could shine forth (*ubi virtus enitescere posset*).” Cicero, *Fam.* 10.10.2, “Would that there were some commonwealth where honor could shine forth (*in qua honos elucere possit*).” Auctor ad Herennium (cited Barton, *Roman Honor*, 64): “the industry of Scipio Africanus brought him virtue, his virtue brought him glory, his glory brought him rivals.”

²³ The virtuous and honorable “shined” in non-Jewish literature, as Barton discusses (*Roman Honor*, 36-53) but δόξα was not typically used to denote “radiance” outside of Jewish and Christian parlance, and so glory as radiance in Paul shows the influence of the scriptural idiom.

²⁴ Barton, *Roman Honor*, 35, and sources cited there, i.e., Cicero, *Phil.* 14.12.32, “to strive through great labors and great perils to achieve the highest praise and glory.”

²⁵ On εἰς ἡμᾶς as accusative of advantage see Rom 3:21-22 (πεφανέρωται...εἰς πάντας τοὺς πιστεύοντας). Cited in Wolter, *Römer*, 509n.16.

eternal weight of glory far beyond comparison (καθ' ὑπερβολὴν εἰς ὑπερβολὴν αἰώνιον βάρος δόξης).” Both texts refer to glory in comparison with suffering and rule the glory much greater than the suffering. In 2 Cor 4:17, as we discussed in chapter 3, the “eternal weight of glory” refers to both the glory of God as divine presence and the glory the righteous take on in divine presence. The same referent appears in view with the glory to be revealed in Rom 8:18. The experience Paul has in view is the appearance of Jesus and God at the second coming and the transformation into a glorious bodily form to occur at that time.²⁶ The experience in view is analogous to the transformation in view in 2 Cor 3:18, where people in the present behold the glory of God and are transformed, and Phil 3:20-21, another reference to the new body, the “body of glory,” taken on in Christ’s presence.

This leads to 8:19-23 and its introduction of the theme of creation. The “eager desire of creation awaits the revelation of the children of God (τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν τῶν υἱῶν τοῦ θεοῦ).” This signals a new state for the people; the “children of God” are the those who are “conformed to Christ’s form,” that Christ might be the firstborn child “among many brothers and sisters.” Paul continues, “For the creation was subjected to futility (τῇ γὰρ ματαιότητι ἡ κτίσις ὑπετάγη), not through its own fault but by the one who subjected it (οὐχ ἑκοῦσα ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸν ὑποτάξαντα), in hope that the creation will be set free from its bondage to corruption in view of the freedom of the glory of the children of God (ἐφ’ ἐλπίδι ὅτι καὶ αὐτὴ ἡ κτίσις ἐλευθερωθήσεται ἀπὸ τῆς

²⁶ Sprinkle, “The Afterlife in Romans,” 216-18, recognizes a reference to the second coming in 8:18: he understands the “glory to be revealed” as a “circumlocution for the parousia of Christ when the glory is manifested unto us with a transformative effect.” Sprinkle, however, wrongly interprets the glory of the righteous as the generic “divine quality of life” and “immortality” (214-16). “Immortality” was not a meaning of δόξα, and the generic gloss “divine quality of life” misses the specific semantic and conceptual associations present in Romans 8.

δουλείας τῆς φθορᾶς εἰς τὴν ἐλευθερίαν τῆς δόξης τῶν τέκνων τοῦ θεοῦ).”²⁷ Paul appeals to the common fate principle that appears in other Jewish literature: there is solidarity between the creation and humans, such that, when humans are under the influence of the negative force, the creation suffers, and, conversely, when humans are released, the rest of creation is released.²⁸ God is the “one who subjected,” and God subjected with a positive intention (“in hope”). There is no appeal here to Adam: the reference to κτίσις does not suggest a reference to Adam, just as there was no link to Adam with the reference to κτίσις in Rom 1:18-32.²⁹ Further, Paul does not use glory to mean “rule,” “dominion,” or “honor associated with power,” as a fulfillment of Adam’s original commission and in line with the putative meaning of glory in OG Ps 8:6.³⁰ The conceptual associations of glorification are with honor, virtue, and transformation in divine presence, not with the righteous “ruling,” a motif that never appears in connection with glory in Paul’s letters.³¹ Paul refers to the “freedom of the glory of God’s children.”³² Freedom is a characteristic of the glory, which poses an issue since glory does not have freedom. The phrase appears to use τῆς δόξης as synecdoche for the “bodies of glory” (σῶματα τῆς δόξης). Paul has

²⁷ The reading εἰς as “in view of” is based on the discussion of Gieniusz, *Romans 8:18-30*, 170-76. The phrase appears intentionally ambiguous. Chrysostom understood it as “because of,” but also seemed to find a temporal referent. Both temporal and causal are suggested.

²⁸ On which Gieniusz, *Romans 8:18-30*, 170-76. I.e., Isa 11:6-9, 43:19-21; 4 Ezra 8:51-54; *1 En.* 45:4-5.

²⁹ Nor does Paul refer to κτίσις in either of the texts where Paul refers to Adam explicitly (Rom 5:12-21; 1 Cor 15:20-49).

³⁰ Contra Dunn, *Romans 1-8*, 469-70, 472, 495; Wright, *Paul and the Faithfulness of God*, 1092; Berry, *Glory in Romans*, 131-35; Jacob, *Conformed to the Image*, 173-266.

³¹ In addition to Romans 8, proponents cite in this connection Phil 3:20-21 and 1 Corinthians 15 (and their putative connections with the glory of OG Ps 8:6), on which see chapter 3 section 2.1. Like Romans, these texts deal with the transformation of the dishonorable body (1 Cor 15:43: “sown in dishonor, raised in glory” in response to question [15:35], “with what kind of body do [the dead] come?”; Phil 3:21: “body of humiliation”/“body of glory”) and do not use glory as authority or power or even articulate the idea of the righteous’ ruling.

³² The adjectival reading, “glorious freedom” (KJV; CEV; GNB), as Berry notes (*Glory in Romans*, 133-34) misses the emphasis on glory for bodies that is the focus of this section.

in view the freedom of the body (8:23, “redemption of our bodies”).³³ Further, that Paul uses synecdoche is likely given that it allowed him to avoid the overlong “the freedom of the bodies of glory of the children of God.” The freedom of the bodies of glory refers to the future, full freedom from the influence of the flesh, since the bodies of the righteous will be transformed.

Romans 8:22-23 continues on the theme of the desire of creation and the future transformation of the righteous. Paul states, “For we know that the whole creation groans together and travails together until now (συστενάζει καὶ συνωδίνει ἄχρι τοῦ νῦν), and not only [the creation], but even ourselves who have the first fruits of the spirit ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτοὶ τὴν ἀπαρχὴν τοῦ πνεύματος ἔχοντες, even we ourselves, groan within ourselves as we wait for adoption, the redemption of our bodies (ἡμεῖς καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς στενάζομεν νιοθεσίαν ἀπεκδεχόμενοι τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν τοῦ σώματος ἡμῶν).” There is again solidarity of the creation with the righteous. The phrase ἀπαρχή τοῦ πνεύματος features the exegetical genitive (cf. 2 Cor 1:22, 5:5, with ἀραβών); Paul refers to the experience of the spirit in the righteous as itself the “firstfruits” of the harvest.³⁴ The image is of the first stage of the process of transformation (cf. 1 Cor 15:20, 23), and, importantly, there is correspondence between the first stage and the later stage: transformation into virtue in divine presence in the present anticipates full transformation into glory (redemption of the body) in divine presence in the future; this being the implied “full harvest” of the metaphor.³⁵

In Rom 8:24-30 the discourse shifts to a tone of hope and confidence in the hope of transformation of the body (cf. “hope” in 8:20). Paul refers to “waiting for” the redemption of the body “with patience.” Paul expected the transformation to occur soon: “the glory about to be

³³ Cf. also reference to σῶμα τῆς δόξης in Phil 3:21.

³⁴ On which Gieniusz, *Romans 8:18-30*, 197-200.

³⁵ Ibid., 199, “As the firstfruits are a piece of the whole, the metaphor alludes also to the substantial *identity* and unbreaking *continuity* between the beginning and the end.”

revealed.” Yet there could be doubting and lack of perseverance, and Paul’s note of confidence, the reference to hope “not seen,” and the reference to the spirit’s help in weakness carries meaning within this framework. Rom 8:28-30 refers to God’s purpose in ordering events as further basis for confidence. Rom 8:29-30 states, “Because those whom God foreknew he also predestined to be conformed to the form of his son (ὅτι οὕς προέγνω, καὶ προώρισεν συμμόρφους τῆς εἰκόνης τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ, so that he might be the firstborn child among many brothers and sisters; and those whom he predestined, he also called, those whom he called, he also justified, and those whom he justified, he also glorified.” The term εἰκὼν refers to “form, likeness.” This and the reference to being glorified in 8:30 do not comprise an allusion to Genesis or Adam’s creation in God’s image. As discussed in chapters 2-4, no motif of the glory of God as image of God of Gen 1:26-27 appears in either the contextual material or in Paul. Paul refers to being conformed into Christ’s likeness as being transformed into a bodily form, that is, the glorified bodily form, that corresponds to Christ’s bodily form. Interpreters have understood the temporal referent of the aorist ἐδόξασεν of 8:30 in divergent ways.³⁶ Interpreters have read this as out place given that in Romans 8 Paul has consistently referred to the experience of glory as happening in the future. The importance of the temporal referent of 8:30 should not be overstated: Paul articulates the idea of a present experience of transformation into glory in 2 Cor 3:18 and refers to the glory of God as divine presence currently enabling virtue in 6:4. Thus, regardless of the interpretation of 8:30, Paul may be characterized as envisioning a present experience of glory. In view of the consistent future orientation of the experience of glory in 8:17-30 and the intention of the subsection (8:28-39) as instilling confidence, I read ἐδόξασεν as referring to a future event that Paul refers to with the aorist due to its certainty; it is a “proleptic”

³⁶ See discussion in Gorman, “Romans: The First Christian Treatise on Theosis,” 27-29; Ortlund, “Inaugurated Glorification,” 111-33.

or “futuristic” aorist.³⁷ Its certainty is dependent on God’s ability to carry out God’s purpose: God called, justified, and will glorify the people’s bodies. This is assured further, in view of Rom 8:31-39, on the basis of God’s love. The *δοξάζω* refers, as with glory in the rest of the section, to the glorification of the dishonorable body. The people take on the honorable, virtuous and radiant form, no longer subject to the influence of impurity, when they are transformed in the presence of God and Jesus, which conforms to their current experience of transformation through the indwelling of the spirit.

1.1 Summary and Note About Glory

We have seen that in Romans 6-8 Paul continues to work with the framework of the influence of the impure force and its effect on the body set up in Romans 1-5. There is new life through the spirit’s indwelling, made possible through purification, and yet the body is still dishonored (1:24). Paul uses the language of glory in these chapters to refer to divine presence (6:4, the spirit; 8:18) and to glorification of believers. This glorification entails taking on an honorable, radiant body that corresponds to Christ’s body. The spirit, dwelling in the purified space of people, enables the virtuous life as a precursor to future eschatological life. There is a correspondence between present and future with respect to both glory and adoption. Paul envision the future glorification of the body in Romans 8, which happens through divine presence when people stand pure before God and Jesus at the eschaton.

³⁷ So also 1 Cor 7:28; John 15:8; Matt 18:15. Calvin read the text this way (*Romans*, 320), however Calvin held that “glorification is not yet exhibited except in our Head,” which does not align with the extent of the evidence (2 Cor 3:18; Rom 9:23).

2. Glory in Romans 9 and 11: Glory for Israel; Riches of Glory for the Righteous; Making the Ministry Glorious; Praise for Benefaction

Romans 9-11 concerns the place of ethnic Jews in God's plan of salvation in relation to what Paul has discussed in the letter up to this point. Paul's rhapsodic language concerning God's love (8:31-39), from which believers will never be separated, leads to an expression of profound grief: Paul has "great sorrow and constant distress" in his heart, and wishes that he might be "accursed, separated from Christ," for his "brothers and sisters, my kinspeople according to the flesh (ὕπὲρ τῶν ἀδελφῶν μου τῶν συγγενῶν μου κατὰ σάρκα)." The basis for Paul's grief is that, currently, Israel in general is not taking part in the eschatological blessings of Romans 8, specifically the spirit, because in general Israel is not believing.³⁸ That Israel is not enjoying these blessings does not accord with their status as Israelites. This is the premise behind Rom 9:4-5: "They are Israelites (οἵτινές εἰσιν Ἰσραηλῖται), whose [are] the adoption, the glory, the covenants, the giving of the law, the worship, the promises (τῶν ἢ υἰοθεσία καὶ ἡ δόξα καὶ αἱ διαθήκαι καὶ ἡ νομοθεσία καὶ ἡ λατρεία καὶ αἱ ἐπαγγελίαι); whose [are] the patriarchs, and from whom, according to the flesh, is Christ..." Paul says that Israel are the chosen people: they are the people to whom God made so many promises. The fact that they are not currently enjoying divine eschatological blessing does not align with this status. This gives rise to the implied

³⁸ Simon Gathercole ("Locating Christ and Israel in Romans 9-11," in *God and Israel: Providence and Purposes in Romans 9-11* [ed. Todd D. Still; Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2017] 117-18) and Michael Wolter ("It is Not as Though the Word of God Has Failed': God's Faithfulness and God's Free Sovereignty in Romans 9:6-29," in *God and Israel*, 28) posit that Paul refers to Israel's position when referring to what position he would be in for the sake of Israel in 9:3, "I would wish myself accursed and separated from Christ (ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ) for the sake of my people," and that this provides the reason for Paul's grief in Rom 9:1-4. It is true that for Paul without belief Israel are ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, but posing that 9:3 presents the basis for Paul's grief is not called for from Rom 9:3 and misses the connection between Romans 8 and 9:1-4. The reason for Paul's grief is that Israel, whom God loves the same way Paul says God loves the righteous in 8:31-39, is not enjoying the eschatological outworking of God's purpose the way that the (mostly gentile) righteous currently are.

question to which Paul responds in Rom 9:6, “But it is not as though the word of God has failed (οὐχ οἷον δὲ ὅτι ἐκπέπτωκεν ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ),” that is, it is not as though, even though Israel in general is not enjoying eschatological blessing, God’s promises to them have become ineffective.³⁹ The “adoption and the glory” must be understood in relation to Romans 8: these are the two central themes in the latter part of the chapter, and Paul refers to them again here in recognition that, due to Israel’s status as Israel, these are things which Israel is owed.⁴⁰ Given this connection it would be wrong to read “the glory” as only referring to divine presence, much less to see this as referring narrowly to Israel’s past or present experience of divine presence.⁴¹ The Greek of Rom 9:4-5 uses the possessive ὧν, which indicates ownership, what belongs to or is due to a person, but indicates nothing either way about past or present possession.⁴² “The glory” refers to all the glory Paul thinks is due to Abraham’s children: divine presence and transformation into glory in divine presence. The adoption, accordingly, means having the “spirit of adoption” in the present and being revealed as God’s children in the future. Israel is owed these things, which means that their current non-enjoyment of them calls the efficacy of God’s promise into question, which is the basis for Paul’s statement in Rom 9:6.

³⁹ On this reading of 6:9, see Wolter, “It is Not as Though the Word of God Has Failed,” 30-31.

⁴⁰ The connection of adoption and glory in 9:4 with Romans 8 recognized in Moo, *Romans*, 563; Jewett, *Romans*, 563; Susan Eastman, “Whose Apocalypse? The Identity of the Sons of God in Romans 8:19,” *JBL* 121 (2002): 266; Sprinkle, “The Afterlife in Romans,” 227; Berry, *Glory in Romans*, 161-66.

⁴¹ Against Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, 230; Leenhardt, *Romans*, 244; Dodd, *Romans*, 151; Barrett, *Romans*, 177; Käsemann, *Romans*, 258-59; Newman, *Paul’s Glory-Christology*, 193; Stowers, *Rereading of Romans*, 130; Fredriksen, “Paul, Purity, and the *Ekklēsia* of the Gentiles,” 213; Idem., *Paul*, 154; Jacob, *Conformed to the Image*, 107.

⁴² Some examples will illustrate this point. If I own a bike, and it is stolen, I no longer have it in my possession, but it is still my bike. If I order a custom-made guitar, there is a contract between me and the luthier for that guitar. The time between the making of it and the time I receive it, I do not have it, but that does not mean that it is not mine. Paul is referring to that which Israel “owns,” that which is theirs by right.

Paul again refers to glory in discussion of God's plan in relation to Israel in Rom 9:19-27. This follows Rom 9:16-18, where Paul made the point that God is free to harden and be merciful to whomever he wishes.⁴³ The objection to which Paul responds is the idea that God cannot find fault, since, if God hardens, God is the reason for the fault of the person. To this Paul responds that God, as the "potter," is free to do with the "clay" of human beings whatever God wishes. Romans 9:22-24 states, "What if God, wishing to show wrath and to make known his power (εἰ δὲ θέλων ὁ θεὸς ἐνδείξασθαι τὴν ὀργὴν καὶ γνωρίσαι τὸ δυνατόν αὐτοῦ), has endured with great patience the vessels of wrath qualified for destruction (ἤνεγκεν ἐν πολλῇ μακροθυμίᾳ σκεύη ὀργῆς κατηρτισμένα εἰς ἀπώλειαν), and in order to make known the riches of his glory for the vessels of mercy, which he prepared before for glory (καὶ ἵνα γνωρίσῃ τὸν πλοῦτον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ σκεύη ἐλέους ἃ προητοίμασεν εἰς δόξαν), including us whom he has called, not from Jews only but also from gentiles?" The "vessels of wrath" are unbelieving Jews: for Paul, these people are at the moment hardened. The "vessels of mercy" are people upon whom God is currently showing mercy, including Paul, the gentile communities, and the Roman addressees.⁴⁴ "Riches of his glory" refers to the figurative wealth that derives from God's presence, "newness of life," "righteousness," which believing people currently experience.⁴⁵ The "prepared

⁴³ On this see John Barclay, "'I Will Have Mercy on whom I Have Mercy': The Golden Calf and Divine Mercy in Romans 9-11 and Second Temple Judaism," *Early Christianity* 1 (2010): 82-106; Simon Gathercole, "Locating Christ and Israel in Romans 9-11," 122-23: "God acts purely on the basis of unprompted mercy, which has hardening as its counterpoint."

⁴⁴ Origen (*Romans*, 7.18.3) recognizes the connection of purification with Rom 9:23: "On the other hand 'for the vessels of mercy,' i.e., those who have cleansed themselves from every sin of defilement."

⁴⁵ Cf. Eph 3:16, "I pray that, according to the riches of his glory (κατὰ τὸ πλοῦτος τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ), he may grant that you be strengthened in your inner being through his spirit." In Rom 9:23 the "vessels of mercy" are currently experiencing the "riches of his glory," also, through God's spirit (cf. Col 1:11, "May you be made strong with all strength according to the power of his glory [κατὰ τὸ κράτος τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ].") The adjectival reading, "glorious riches" (J. Ross Wagner, "'Enemies' Yet 'Beloved' Still: Election and the Love of God in Romans 9-11," in *God and Israel*, 107) does not align with the meaning of glory in Romans or the importance of divine presence in the argument of the letter.

beforehand for glory” refers not only to transformation in divine presence but also divine presence itself: it is all the glory for which God has prepared the people and made available to them, presently, through believing (6:4; 2 Cor 3:18).⁴⁶ Paul’s point in 9:21-23 is that God is free to do what God wants with humans, and there is no basis on which to argue with God. A secondary point is that God has hardened unbelieving Israel, to “show his wrath and to make known his power,” and because, according to the logic of the text, this allowed God to “make known the riches of his glory” to the people who are currently believing.

Romans 11 uses the language of glory in relation to the theme of Israel’s jealousy (παραζηλώω), which Paul introduces in 11:11 (cf. 10:19). The jealousy consists of being “troubled by the belief, suspicion or fear that the good which one desires to gain or keep for oneself has been or may be diverted to another.”⁴⁷ Paul states that through Israel’s “transgression” the salvation has come to the gentiles, and “if their transgression is riches for the world, and their failure is riches for the gentiles, how much more their fullness.” Paul states (11:13-14): “I am speaking to gentiles (ὁμῖν δὲ λέγω τοῖς ἔθνεσιν). Inasmuch as I am an apostle to the gentiles, I make my ministry glorious (ἐφ’ ὅσον μὲν οὖν εἰμι ἐγὼ ἐθνῶν ἀπόστολος τὴν διακονίαν μου δοξάζω), if somehow I might make my kinspeople jealous and save some of them (εἴ πως παραζηλώσω μου τὴν σάρκα καὶ σώσω τινὰς ἐξ αὐτῶν).” Paul’s glorifying his ministry is the reason for the Jews becoming jealous.⁴⁸ A parallel use of the term διακονία appears in 2

⁴⁶ Rom 9:23b has almost always been understood as referring to future transformation into glory. This is not necessitated by Paul’s use of the language of glory, nor does it make sense in a text where Paul is talking about what God is currently doing.

⁴⁷ Richard H. Bell, *Provoked to Jealousy: The Origin and Purpose of the Jealousy Motif in Romans 9-11* (WUNT II/63; J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck]: Tübingen, 1994) 5-43. Bell highlights that jealousy in Romans 11 also has the positive sense of “emulation.”

⁴⁸ This has not often been recognized. Käsemann (*Romans*, 306) and Jewett (*Romans*, 679) have difficulty reconciling the idea that Paul glorifies his ministry with the idea of only “boasting in the Lord.” A potential qualm about boasting in one’s own achievement is not present in this context. Berry (*Glory in Romans*, 173-74) states that “the verb ‘glorify’ highlights the centrality that God’s glory has in Paul’s

Corinthians 3-4 (3:7, 8, 9, 4:1). Cranfield sought to explain the relationship between the glorifying and the jealousy by saying that Paul glorifies his ministry in the sense that he “honours and reverences his ministry to the Gentiles, and so fulfills it with all his might and devotion...that its success may provoke the Jews to jealousy.”⁴⁹ This is a linguistically sound reading of δοξάζω, but it must introduce an additional rationale that the verb does not signify. In this reading the glorifying is not the actual basis for Israel’s jealousy; rather, Paul’s hard work and success is the basis. I read the verb as meaning “to make glorious, to make radiant.” This aligns with the use of the verb elsewhere in Paul.⁵⁰ Texts use glory to refer to the attractive appearance of objects.⁵¹ This account, further, provides a rationale for how the glorifying relates to the jealousy. By making Paul’s ministry glorious and thus attractive, Israel might desire its offer of new life. In Rom 11:36 Paul uses glory as praise in connection to the idea of God as universal benefactor: “For from him and through him and to him are all things (ὅτι ἐξ αὐτοῦ καὶ δι’ αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν τὰ πάντα). To him be glory forever. Amen (αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας ἀμήν).” No one has “ever given a gift to God to receive a gift in return.” The verse, with the previously treated examples (chapter 3 section 2.3), indicates the association of glory as praise with the concept of God as benefactor of the universe. The doxological formula αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας ἀμήν parallels Gal 1:5, Phil 4:20, and Rom 16:27.

3.1 Summary and Note About Glory

ministry.” While I agree that glory is an important feature of Paul’s teaching, this is not indicated in any respect in Rom 11:13.

⁴⁹ Cranfield, *Romans*, 2.560. Cf. Moo, *Romans*, 691, “I take pride in it and work very hard at it.”

⁵⁰ Cf. 2 Cor 3:10 [x2]; Rom 8:17, 30.

⁵¹ Chapter 2 section 1.4.

In Romans 9 and 11 we see Paul use the language of glory to refer to divine presence and transformation in divine presence; to making the ministry glorious and thus attractive; and to glory as praise to God on account of benefaction. In 9:4 Paul refers to the glory that is due to Israel: “the glory” is all the glory that in Paul’s view is due to Abraham’s children. Romans 9:23 refers to the riches that derive from divine presence and to the divine presence and transformation in divine presence that the “vessels of mercy” are currently enjoying. Romans 11:13 uses glorify as “to make glorious.” Paul makes his ministry glorious so that his kinspeople will desire what it offers. Romans 11:36 features a doxological formula that attributes glory to God on account of his status as the universal patron who provides all things and to whom all things are due.

4. Glory in Romans 15-16: Glorifying God with One Voice; Doxology

Paul uses the language of glory three times at the end of the section consisting of Rom 14:1-15:13. In this discussion Paul treats the issue of disputes between people he calls the “strong” and the “weak.”⁵² The issue in Rome concerns principally dietary purity observances (14:5-6, 13-23).⁵³ Paul wants the people to “welcome” (προσλαμβάνω) those with differences of opinion on the issue.⁵⁴ Paul refers to the example of Jesus in Rom 15:1-5: Jesus “did not please

⁵² On which see John M. G. Barclay, “‘Do we undermine the Law?’ A Study of Romans 14.1-15.6” in *Paul and the Mosaic Law* (ed. James D. G. Dunn; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996) 287-308; Troels Engberg-Pedersen, “‘Everything is clean’ and ‘Everything that is not of faith is sin’; The Logic of Pauline Casuistry in Romans 14.1-15.13” in *Paul, Grace, and Freedom: Essays in Honour of John K. Riches* (New York: T&T Clark, 2008) 22-38; Kathy Ehrensperger, “‘Called to Be Saints,’” 90-110.

⁵³ On the idea that Paul addresses an actual situation in Rome, see Mark Reasoner, *The Strong and the Weak: Romans 14.1-15.13 in Context* [SNTSMS 10; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999] 24-44; against Robert J. Karris, “Romans 14.1-15.13 and the Occasion of Romans,” in *The Romans Debate* (ed. Karl P. Donfried; Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1977) 65-84.

⁵⁴ On the verb προσλαμβάνω see Jewett, *Romans*, 835-36. Interpreters have debated about the situation in view in Rom 14:1-15:13 and specifically the identification of the people Paul calls “strong” and “weak.”

himself,” those in Rome are likewise not to please themselves but seek to please the others.

Glory appears in the wish of Rom 15:5-6, “May the God of perseverance and encouragement give you the same mind among one another, according to Jesus Christ (ὁ δὲ θεὸς τῆς ὑπομονῆς καὶ τῆς παρακλήσεως δώῃ ὑμῖν τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν ἐν ἀλλήλοις κατὰ Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν), in order that unanimously with one voice you may glorify the God and father of our Lord Jesus Christ (ἵνα ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἐν ἐνὶ στόματι δοξάζητε τὸν θεὸν καὶ πατέρα τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ).” The reference to “with one voice” appears to imply a congregational context: it may refer to singing as a means of glorifying God; to the communal Amen, which is “for the glory of God” (2 Cor 1:20; communal thanksgiving, 1 Cor 14:16); or both of these things. The “with one voice” also implies the physical placement of the people together. The precursor to the glorifying with one voice is that the people have “the same mind,” which implies the desire for a resolution to the issue of purity observances currently dividing the groups. The verb δοξάζω as honor in connection with God occurs also in 1 Cor 6:20, Gal 1:24, 2 Cor 9:13, and Rom 15:9.

In Rom 15:7 Paul again refers to welcoming and connects this with glory. Romans 15:7-9 states: “Welcome one another, therefore, just as Christ welcomed you, for the glory of God (διὸ προσλαμβάνεσθε ἀλλήλους καθὼς καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς προσελάβετο ὑμᾶς εἰς δόξαν τοῦ θεοῦ). For I say that Christ became a servant of the uncircumcised on behalf of the truth of God (λέγω γὰρ Χριστὸν διάκονον γεγενῆσθαι περιτομῆς ὑπὲρ ἀληθείας θεοῦ), in order that he might confirm the promises given to the patriarchs (εἰς τὸ βεβαιῶσαι τὰς ἐπαγγελίας τῶν πατέρων), and in order that the Gentiles might glorify God for his mercy (τὰ δὲ ἔθνη ὑπὲρ ἐλέους δοξάσαι τὸν θεόν)...” The majority of interpreters understand εἰς δόξαν τοῦ θεοῦ as meaning “for the glory of God,” such that the welcoming of believers and Christ’s welcoming results in praise for God (so also εἰς δόξαν τοῦ θεοῦ in 1 Cor 10:31; 2 Cor 4:15; Phil 1:11, 2:11). Certain interpreters have

understood the εἰς in εἰς δόξαν τοῦ θεοῦ as denoting movement into a sphere. The meaning is thus that “just as Christ welcomed you into the glory of God.”⁵⁵ This reading has certain points in its favor. Paul uses the εἰς in the sense of movement into in other settings and specifically in reference to movement into divine presence in 1 Thess 2:12. In addition, certain papyri use the construction προσλαμβάνω + εἰς + accusative, which indicates the linguistic viability of the interpretation.⁵⁶ Nevertheless, that εἰς δόξαν τοῦ θεοῦ is “for the glory of God” appears certain in view of the context of Rom 15:7. The verse immediately preceding and 15:8-9, like 15:7, use purpose clauses that indicate that their corresponding actions are intended to glorify God. Romans 15:7 and 9 are especially close in this regard insofar as they refer to Christ’s agency: Christ welcomed εἰς δόξαν τοῦ θεοῦ in Rom 15:7 and (15:8-9) Christ “became a servant of the circumcised...in order that the gentiles might glorify God for their mercy (εἰς τὸ... τὰ δὲ ἔθνη ὑπὲρ ἐλέους δοξάσαι τὸν θεόν).” In view of these factors, the reading “for the glory of God” in 15:7 is assured. In 15:8-9 Paul refers to Christ’s service to the circumcised so that Jews and gentiles might worship God together. Paul cites a series of scriptural texts that refer to Israel worshipping with gentiles and to Christ as ruling gentiles (OG Ps 17:50; LXX Deut 32:43, Ps 117:1; OG Isa 11:10).

The final reference to glory in the canonical form of the letter appears in Rom 16:25-27, the doxology: “Now to God who is able to strengthen you according to my gospel and the

⁵⁵ Tholuck, *Romans*, 425; cf. Jewett, *Romans*, 889n.25, who affirms the possibility of the reading while also reading “for the glory of God.”

⁵⁶ BGU 1141, 37 (14 BC), “I welcomed him into my house (προσελάβομην αὐτὸν εἰς οἶκον παρ’ ἐμέ).” PTebt 61a, 2 (2nd cent. BC), “Who were welcomed into the dwelling (τῶν προσληφθέντων εἰς τὴν κατοικίαν).” Cited in BDAG, s.v. προσλαμβάνω. Cf. a phylactery of Moses, from 2nd or 3rd cent. AD, “A phylactery which Moses used to [protect] him in the Holy of Holies (and) to lead him into the glory of (the) divine (ἐν τῷ ἀγαγεῖν αὐτὸν εἰς τὴν δόξαν φυσικοῦ).” Translated and discussed in Roy Kotansky, *Greek Magical Amulets: The Inscribed Gold, Silver, Copper, and Bronze Lamellae Part I Published Texts of Known Provenance* (Papyrologica Coloniensia 22.1; Springer Fachmedien Wiesbaden, 1994) 1.126-54; cited in Jewett, *Romans*, 889n.25.

preaching of Jesus Christ (τῷ δὲ δυναμένῳ ὑμᾶς στηρίξαι κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιόν μου καὶ τὸ κήρυγμα Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ) ...to the only wise God, through Jesus Christ, be glory forever and ever. Amen (μόνῳ σοφῷ θεῷ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ᾧ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας ἀμήν).” The origin of this section has long been a matter of debate.⁵⁷ Its placement varies in the manuscript tradition.⁵⁸ A further issue is the style of the verses: the verses have been deemed as being more liturgical than is usual for Paul’s letters.⁵⁹ Some interpreters, further, have argued that 16:25-27 is Marcionite in character and thus does not align with Paul’s own views.⁶⁰ Harry Gamble’s influential study countered this argument by indicating that 16:25-27 is “characteristic of a clearly defined pattern of early Christian proclamation.”⁶¹ Concerning the reason for the section, the longstanding theory has been that it was composed as a conclusion to Marcion’s 14-chapter version.⁶² Larry Hurtado problematized this theory by arguing that the section was composed based on a version of Romans with at least 15 chapters.⁶³ The conclusion in Hurtado, that further research is in order, is followed here.⁶⁴ As far as the use of glory in 16:25-27, the ᾧ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας ἀμήν is standard, though the connection of glory “through Jesus Christ” does not

⁵⁷ See Kümmel, *Introduction to the New Testament*, 314-20; Harry Gamble, *The Textual History*, 123-24; Hurtado, “The Doxology at the End of Romans,” 185-99; Jeffrey A. D. Weima, *Neglected Endings: The Significance of the Pauline Letter Closings* (JSNTSup 101; Sheffield: JSOT, 1994) 140-44, 215-20; Longenecker, *Introducing Romans*, 34-38; Idem., *Romans*, 1083-86.

⁵⁸ Examples are, the doxology placed after 16:23/24: P⁶¹ & B C D 81 365 436 Origen^{lat}; after 14:23: L Psy 0209^{vid} 181 326 330 451 Theodoret; after 15:33: P⁴⁶; after both 14:23 and 16:23/24: A P 5 17; after both 14:23 and 15:33: 1506; omitted: F G Marcion and Jerome.

⁵⁹ Kümmel, *Introduction*, 317; Gamble, *Textual History*, 123-24.

⁶⁰ Kümmel, *Introduction*, 317; Käsemann, *Romans*, 421-28; cf. Jewett, *Romans*, 8. The features thought to be Marcionite are that in the passage the revelation was concealed before the appearance of Paul and Paul himself is the bearer of the hidden revelation.

⁶¹ Gamble, *Textual History*, 108.

⁶² Thus, Kümmel, *Introduction*, 315-17; more recently, Jewett, *Romans*, 8.

⁶³ Hurtado, “The Doxology,” 197-98.

⁶⁴ Hurtado, “The Doxology,” 199. Weima, “Neglected Endings,” 215-20, and Longenecker, *Romans*, 1083-86, rule in favor of the originality of 16:25-27 and its placement at the conclusion of the letter, but they do not seek to establish this in view of the problem posed by the textual tradition.

appear elsewhere in association with δόξα in a doxology. The verses attributes praise to God who strengthens the people and whose command results in the “obedience of faith” (cf. Rom 1:5).

4.1 Summary and Note about Glory

In Romans 15 and 16 Paul uses the language of glory as praise to God. In Romans 15 he appeals to glorifying God as a basis for encouraging the people to “welcome one another.” The people in Rome glorifying God with one voice is in line with the biblical expectation that Israel and non-Israel would worship God together. This is due to mercy shown to the people (15:9), which connects the praising with benefaction. In Romans 16 Paul uses a doxology to attribute glory to God for his present strengthening of the people and for God’s purposes in history.

5. Conclusion

In this discussion we indicated that in Romans 6-8, where the language of glory appears four times, Paul continues to work with the framework of ideas Paul presented in Romans 1-5. Divine presence remains a central emphasis. Jesus is the means of cleansing the people so that they may be indwelt with the spirit, and the spirit is the means by which the people may be virtuous in the present. Romans 8 highlights, though, the need for further intervention. Paul refers to the transformation into the glorious bodily form. The people’s bodies are “glorified” in reversal of the dishonoring of the body in Rom 1:24. The future bodily form is the honorable, virtuous, radiant form that is analogous to Jesus’ form, which people take on in divine presence. The transformation of the body is the final “redemption” of the body; the body is no longer subject to the influence of the impure force. In Romans 8, Paul couples the themes of adoption and glory, and these themes are paired again in Rom 9:4-5. Paul states that Israel is owed

eschatological blessing based on God's promise, and their present non-enjoyment of this does not *prima facie* align with their status as Israelites. In Rom 9:23 Paul refers to the present enjoyment of divine presence and transformation into glory of the vessels of mercy. Romans 11:13 uses δοξάζω in relation to appearance, "to make glorious," so that he might cause Israel to desire what it offers. In Rom 11:36 and chapters 15-16 glory language refers to honor as praise to God. Romans 11:36 presents this in relation to God's universal benefaction.

This concludes the analysis of the language of glory in the Letter to the Romans. We have seen that glory language in the letter does not occur in connection with Adam either explicitly or through allusion. The conceptual associations that glory bears in Romans 6-16 align with the associations that appear elsewhere in Paul's letters. Glory is associated with honor, divine patronage, purity, radiance, divine presence, and transformation. Paul associates present transformation with the spirit, and in Rom 6:4 uses the phrase "glory of the father" in reference to the spirit. The process of transformation in the present, through the spirit, corresponds to the process of transformation in the future, when believers are transformed in the presence of God and Jesus.

Conclusion

Here we may draw together the strands of the analysis. This study has offered a comprehensive investigation of the language of glory in the Letter to the Romans. It considered the semantic value and the conceptual associations of the language in Paul's idiom, and it investigated the logic at play in the texts where Paul employs the language. In this conclusion we will summarize each chapter and highlight the main findings of the analysis. I will then consider some points of contact between glory language in Paul and other ancient sources and note implications for future research.

1. Outline

Chapter one situated the study within the history of research. This involved considering the trends in past readings of glory. I noted the diversity of interpretations of instances thought to refer to glory for humans. I highlighted the Adam reading and certain interpreters who emphasize the dynamic of honor and shame. I then interacted with recent focused studies of the topic. In chapter two I investigated the way the language of glory was commonly used in antiquity. I noted the meanings "expectation," "opinion," "honor," "divine presence," and "radiance." I also considered the discourses in which the language of glory featured: the discourse of honor and shame; the discourse of primeval humanity; the discourse of cultic purity and divine presence; and the discourse of eschatological expectation. I showed how the language of glory figured within each of these discourses. In chapter three I discussed the letters of Paul other than Romans. I considered themes in Paul's letters in relation to which Paul's glory language should be understood. I highlighted the process of transformation, which for Paul is

taking on glory in divine presence. I noted uses of glory as divine presence in Paul and the conceptual association of glory and purity in settings where Paul refers to divine presence. I discussed the use of glory language in connection to divine benefaction and in relation to the dynamics of honor within Paul's communities.

In chapter four I discussed the use of the language of glory in Romans 1-5. I highlighted that Rom 1:18-32 refers to primeval people not distinguished on the basis of ethnicity, who exchange the presence of God for the presence of idols. They do not worship God but instead worship idols (1:20-23), and this idolatry creates impurity. God cannot abide among impurity, so God, as an expression of wrath, leaves the people, "handing them over" to the influence of the impurity, which results in the dishonoring of their bodies. The impurity dwelling within the people leads them into greater and greater vice (1:24-32). This implicates Paul's present people; they are under the influence of impurity and thus are ἄδικοι. Paul states in Rom 3:9, "All, both Jews and Greeks, are under sin," which, as we saw, is another way of referring to the impure force referred to in Rom 1:18-32. Paul refers to the situation of Rom 1:18-32 again in Rom 3:23: "All sinned and lack the glory of God," that is, the people are impure and do not have divine presence, since God has moved away from them as an expression of wrath. The solution to this is Jesus as a place of atonement, ἱλαστήριον, whose purgative blood cleanses those who have faith of impurity. This purification makes divine presence in the present and future possible. This purification is the means of justification insofar as purification makes the people fit to be indwelt by the spirit, so that the people may be just. In Rom 5:2 Paul refers to confidence in future purity and future enjoyment of the glory of God: "we boast in the hope of the glory of God. Amid the discussion of Romans 1-5 we also considered instances where Paul refers to glory to God (1:21, 3:7, 4:20). We highlighted the connection of these instances with the idea of divine

benefaction. We also noted Paul's use of the language, in Rom 2:7 and 10, to refer to radiance as a blessing for doing good.

In chapter 5 we discussed the language of glory in Romans 6-16. I highlighted that, in Romans 6-8, Paul continues to work with the framework of impurity and divine presence he presented in Romans 1-5. Paul refers to the spirit as the "glory of the father" as the means of virtuous life, "newness of life." In Rom 8:1-11 Paul again refers to Jesus' purifying agency that makes the indwelling of the spirit possible. Jesus is a purification offering, *περὶ ἁμαρτίας*, who removes sin from inside the person, so that the people may be indwelt by the holy spirit and thus walk according to the spirit. In Rom 8:17-30 Paul refers to transformation of the body that happens in divine presence. Being glorified in divine presence is the reversal of the "dishonoring of their bodies" of Rom 1:24. Paul envisions the people taking on an honorable form of radiance that corresponds to Christ's form. Paul pairs the themes of adoption and glory in Romans 8, and these themes appear again in Rom 9:1-5. The "glory" of Rom 9:4 refers to divine presence and transformation into glory that is Israel's on account of their status as being Israel. In 9:23 Paul refers to the "riches of his glory," that is, the riches that derive from God's presence, that the vessels of mercy, those "prepared for glory" (divine presence and transformation), are currently enjoying. Romans 11:13 uses glorify as "to make glorious" in relation to Paul's ministry, and there are four occurrences of glory as praise in Romans 15-16. These instances, like the other instances of glory as praise to God in Paul, indicate the conceptual connection of glory as praise to divine benefaction.

2. Associations of Glory in Paul

In view of the completed analysis of Romans we may now give an overview of the associations of the language of glory in Paul's parlance. These associations may be considered in terms of three categories: (1) instances where glory is used in relation to something people have or might have; (2) instances where glory as praise to God is signaled; and (3) other instances. In relation to the first category, our study has shown that δόξα language in connection with people may refer to divine presence that humans enjoy, might have enjoyed, or will enjoy. In 1 Thess 2:12 Paul refers to people called into δόξα, a reference to divine presence. 2 Corinthians 3:7-13 uses the language of glory 10 times to refer to divine presence and/or radiance that comes from divine presence. 2 Corinthians 3:18 refers to "beholding the glory of the Lord," where the phrase signals seeing divine presence, and divine presence is likewise signaled with the phrase ἀπὸ δόξης as the source of the people's transformation. In 2 Cor 4:4 the "glory of Christ" is the divine presence of Christ, who is the "image of God," to which believers have access through the gospel, and Paul refers to the glory of God as divine presence shining in hearts in 2 Cor 4:6. In Romans, Paul refers strictly to divine presence with the language of glory in Rom 1:23, 3:23, and 6:4. The "immortal glory of God" refers to the presence of God that people give up in exchange for idols, and Rom 3:23 refers to this lost divine presence with the phrase the glory of God. Romans 6:4 refers to the "glory of the father" as a reference to the spirit. There is also in Rom 9:23 the reference to the "riches of his glory" as riches deriving from divine presence.

There are in addition the uses of glory language that refer to the humans glorified state. These are 1 Cor 2:7, "prepared beforehand for our glory," and 1 Cor 15:43, where Paul refers to being raised "in glory." There is also 2 Cor 3:18, where εἰς δόξαν refers to the glorified state taken on in divine presence. In Phil 3:21 Paul refers to the "body of glory," the transformed body characterized by glory. In Romans, Rom 2:7 and 10 refer to glory as radiance as a reward for

people who do good. Romans 8:17 refers to being “glorified with Jesus,” which refers to the eschatological honorable form, and 8:21 and 8:30 also refer to the glorified form. There are, in addition, the instances where δόξα language denotes both divine presence and transformation into glory. These are 2 Cor 4:17, “the eternal weight of glory,” as well as Rom 5:2, the “hope of the glory of God.” The language denotes both divine presence and transformation also in Rom 8:18, “the glory about to be revealed,” and Rom 9:4, in reference to the glory that is Israel’s by right. Both divine presence and transformation are also in view in Rom 9:23b, where Paul refers to the vessels of mercy having been “prepared before for glory.” Paul’s references to divine presence and transformation into glory are related insofar as the transformation into glory happens in divine presence. This entails finding the idea of divine presence in settings where Paul refers to transformation into glory but does not refer explicitly to divine presence (1 Cor 2:7; 1 Cor 15:43; Rom 8:30).

These uses of the language are associated with the ideas of purity, honor, and radiance. Glory as divine presence is associated with purity insofar as for Paul purity is necessary for divine presence. The association of divine presence and purity is present where Paul refers to the necessity of purity for the holy spirit in the temple of people’s bodies (1 Cor 3:16, 6:19; 2 Cor 6:14-7:1) and refers to the necessity of being pure for being in God’s presence at the eschaton (1 Thess 3:13; 5:23; Phil 1:10-10). The association of purity specifically with glory as divine presence appears in 2 Cor 2:14-4:6, where Paul makes explicit the need for εἰλικρίνεια for standing in God’s presence (2:14) and in the context of a discussion about beholding the glory of the Lord (3:18). The association of purity with glory as divine presence is also present in Romans 1-8. The people of Rom 1:18-32 lose the glory of God on account of impurity, and Paul refers to this in Rom 3:23. In Rom 5:2, Paul assumes the future purity of the righteous with

reference to their confidence in enjoying divine presence in the future, and in Romans 8 Paul refers to the purifying agency of Jesus in a discussion in which he also refers to the future experience of glory in the form of divine presence and transformation. Thus, from these settings we may conclude that there is a strong association of glory as divine presence with purity in Paul's letters. This is, further, conceptually connected with glorification insofar as glorification happens in divine presence. Purity is necessary for divine presence, and divine presence is the means of transformation; thus, purity is necessary for transformation.

Further associations of these instances of the language are with honor and radiance. In 2 Cor 3:7-13 glory is associated with radiance, and Paul envisions people taking on a glory that corresponds to God's glory in 2 Cor 3:18. In 1 Cor 15:40-43 Paul refers to glory of humans following reference to the glory of stars. The association with honor is evident in Phil 3:21, where Paul refers to the *σῶμα τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ* as opposed to the *σῶμα τῆς ταπεινώσεως ἡμῶν* (cf. 1 Cor 15:43; 1 Cor 2:7-8). The association is also clear in Romans 1-8, where glorification involves making the body honorable and virtuous in contrast to its once dishonorable status (1:24). We defined the glorified state as an honorable form characterized by radiance that corresponds to Christ's form.

Within (1), there are, in addition, instances that refer to glory for humans that denote esteem or reputation, non-eschatological glory. 1 Thess 2:6 refers to not seeking praise from humans (*οὔτε ζητοῦντες ἐξ ἀνθρώπων δόξαν*) but rather seeking to please God. 1 Thess 2:20 refers to the Thessalonians as a source of pride for Paul, "You are our glory and joy (*γάρ ἐστε ἡ δόξα ἡμῶν καὶ ἡ χαρά*)."

Paul refers to his readers as being wise, strong, and "held in honor" (*ἐνδοξος*; 4:10), while Paul himself is held in dishonor (*ἄτιμος*). In 1 Cor 12:26 Paul refers to a member of the body being honored ("If one member is honored, all rejoice") and Paul uses the

language of glory throughout 1 Cor 11:2-16 in reference to people bringing honor to others and to God; in 1 Cor 11:7 “man” is a source of honor for God (δόξα θεοῦ) and woman is supposed to be a source of honor for man (δόξα ἀνδρός; cf. 2 Cor 8:23, δόξα Χριστοῦ). 2 Corinthians 6:8 refers to seasons of good and bad reputation (διὰ δόξης καὶ ἀτιμίας διὰ δυσφημίας καὶ εὐφημίας). These instances do not indicate an association with purity and radiance. Interestingly, no occurrences of glory as esteem or non-eschatological glory for humans appear in the Letter to the Romans.

The second category (2) consists of instances of glory as praise to God. These appear in the doxological formulae (Gal 1:5; Phil 4:20; Rom 11:36, 16:27). These occur as part of the construction εἰς τὴν δόξαν τοῦ θεοῦ (1 Cor 10:31; 2 Cor 4:15; Rom 15:7; Phil 1:11, 2:11) and in the construction πρὸς τὴν τοῦ κυρίου δόξαν (2 Cor 8:19; cf. 2 Cor 1:20). Paul uses the verb form to mean honoring God (2 Cor 9:13; Gal 1:24 Rom 1:21, 23; Rom 15:6, 9) and in Rom 4:20 uses the scriptural expression “give glory to God” (δοῦς δόξαν τῷ θεῷ). These instances consistently show the connection of glory as praise to God with the concept of divine benefaction. 2 Corinthians 4:15 refers to χάρις spreading which results in praise to God. Romans 11:36 refers to glory to God amid discussion of whether God has received a gift from anyone, and where Paul refers to God as the one through whom and to whom all things are: “to God be glory forever.” In Rom 15:9 the gentiles glorify God “for his mercy,” which is related to benefaction. Paul regularly couples the language of glory as praise with the language of thanksgiving (2 Cor 4:15, 9:11, 12, 13; Rom 1:21), another term that has meaning within the discourse of patronage and benefaction. Thus, there is a strong association between glory as praise to God and benefaction and patronage, and Paul’s references to glory to God ought to be understood within this framework.

The third category (3) comprises those instances that do not fit into the other two categories. This includes 1 Cor 2:8, where Paul uses glory as a title for Jesus, “the Lord of Glory.” This includes, as well, the five instances to glory in 1 Cor 15:40-43, where Paul refers to the splendor of stars. In Rom 11:13 Paul states that he “glorifies” his ministry in the sense that he makes his ministry glorious and thus attractive, so that Israel might be jealous. The instances in 1 Corinthians 15:40-43 and Rom 11:13 indicate an association with radiance. The title “Lord of Glory” certainly includes the idea of honor, and it is plausible that it also indicates the idea of radiance, in view of Paul’s association of radiance with δόξα and the idea of Christ’s eschatological bodily form as radiant. Thus, we see that Paul’s use of glory language had associations with divine presence, purity, transformation, honor, radiance, and benefaction, and that these associations are indicated at different moments according to the topics in view.

3. Connections with Ancient Literature

We may also, here, note connections of Paul’s use of the language of glory with other ancient sources. These connections may be considered in relation to the different facets of Paul’s employment of the language. First, Paul’s use of the language of glory in connection with transformation into glory in divine presence aligns with the convention of taking on radiance in divine presence in other early Jewish and early Christian sources. We noted these sources in chapter 2.¹ Thus, for example, Isaiah 60:1-2 states that the “glory of the Lord will shine upon you (ἡ δόξα αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ σὲ ὀφθήσεται),” and *I En.* 38:1-4 states those who possess the earth “will not be able to behold the faces of the holy ones” since “the light of the Lord of Spirits has shined on the face of the holy.”² The dynamic appearing in Paul’s letters also parallels the experience of

¹ Chapter 2 section 2.4.

² Cf. *I. En.* 62.13-16; *Bar* 5:1-9; *Ps. Sol.* 17:30-31; 1 John 3:2-3.

Moses in Exod 34:29-35, and, given that Paul explicitly appropriates this passage in 2 Corinthians 3-4 in relation to the glory of the righteous, it would difficult to deny that this text had some bearing on Paul's concept of the transformation. However, Paul's references to glorification, it must be emphasized, also have the association with honor. It would not be possible to examine whether this association appears in the other texts; in certain cases the connection with honor may also be present; but this association should be noted in connection to Paul's idea of transformation into glory in divine presence. Second, Paul's notion of the eschatological body as honorable has points of connection with ancient discussions about virtue. As discussed in chapters 2 and 5, honor was connected to virtue insofar as honor derived from virtue, just as shame derived from vice. Paul attests to this connection in relation to the glorified body as the reversal of the dishonorable body in Romans 1-8.

Importantly, this context explains how the glorification of people relates to ethics. Interpreters have sought to explain this by defining glory as a "divine likeness," a "spiritual-ethical concept," a "manner of being."³ These readings sought to affirm what is legitimately a feature of the text but did so by sacrificing the meaning of glory language. An exegetically responsible reading of glory connects the glorification with ethics through recognizing the connection of glory with honor and correspondingly the connection of honor with virtue. The glorified person is honorable, which means they are virtuous. A third connection between glory in Romans and other ancient literature is the shared connection of divine presence with purity. Paul's references to the purity necessary for enjoying divine presence parallels the convention of purity necessary for enjoying divine presence attested across ancient literature, and Paul's reference to the loss of divine presence on account of impurity accords with the early Jewish

³ Noted in Blackwell, "Immortal Glory," 291-92.

convention.⁴ The manner that Paul's presentation of the loss of divine presence is distinctly Jewish/Christian is that Paul refers to divine presence with the language of glory, which was a distinctly scriptural idiom. A fourth connection of Paul's use of glory with the ancient literature, specifically the early Christian literature, is the association of glory as divine presence with Jesus' agency as a means of purification.⁵ Early Christian texts refer to Jesus as a sacrifice that purifies that makes enjoyment of divine presence possible; thus 1 Peter 3:18, "Christ suffered once for all to bring you to God"; Titus 2:13-14, "We wait for the blessed hope and manifestation of the glory of our God and Savior Jesus Christ, who gave himself for us that he might redeem us from all lawlessness and purify for himself a people..."; Heb 10:19, "since we have confidence to enter the sanctuary by the blood of Jesus"; Eph 3:13, 18, "Now in Christ Jesus you who were once far off have been brought near by the blood of Christ...for through him both of us have access in one spirit to the father." An equivalent logic appears in Romans 1-8 with references to Jesus as a ἱλαστήριον and περὶ ἁμαρτίας that makes enjoyment of God's presence possible.

A fifth connection is glory and divine patronage in Paul and references to divine patronage in the general context. The idea in Paul parallels the idea in Apuleius, *Metam.* 11.6, where Isis says to Lucius, "I will favour you and you will constantly worship me...by assiduous obedience, worshipful service, and determined celibacy." From a Jewish source, Philo likewise states that the person who enjoys divine benefaction (*Spec.* 1.224) "is, of necessity, bound to require God...who has bestowed untroubled salvation and unalloyed benefits...with hymns, and songs, and prayers...all which taken together have received the one comprehensive name of praise." Further, sixth, and finally, there is connection between Paul's references to glory as

⁴ Chapter 2 section 2.3.

⁵ See chapter 2 section 2.3.

esteem, non-eschatological glory, and the convention in ancient literature generally. Paul's reference to seeking to please God rather than humans (1 Thess 2:6) accords with the rhetorical strategy of shifting considerations of honor to the perspective of the one who knows, the good person, rather than focusing on the opinion of the majority. Likewise, Paul appeals to people's sense of honor and shame in 1 Cor 11:2-16 in connection with glory. These texts have parallels in the broader context.⁶ Glory as non-eschatological honor or esteem for humans appears in 1 Thess; 1 Cor; 2 Cor; and Phil but is absent from Rom; Gal; and Phlm.

3. Implications for Further Research

Our study has shown the importance of the dynamics of purity and divine presence for understanding Paul's glory language. As a matter of further enquiry, one might explore to what extent the presentation of purity and divine presence in Romans parallels or is different from other early Jewish and early Christian texts.⁷ Relatedly, our study raises the question of the importance of the motif of Jesus as a sacrificial means of purification. Paul employed this motif, as we discussed, and it appears in other early Christian texts. It would be a matter of further enquiry to determine how much further this image was appropriated; whether it continued to be used into the period following the early Christian period. Origen indicates sensitivity to the dynamics of purity in Paul's letters. Was this a standard way of understanding matters related to justification, the spirit, and glory in early Christianity? Looking strictly at Paul, one might investigate how the purity and divine presence motif in Romans parallels or is different from other soteriological logics in Paul's letters. Given our recognition of the purity dynamic in Paul's

⁶ See chapter 2 section 2.1.

⁷ In view of this study Romans 1-8 may be integrated into more general analyses of purity discourse in early Judaism and early Christianity, such as those that appeared in Klawans, *Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple*; Blidstein, *Purity, Community, and Ritual*.

account of the problem and solution in Romans, what implications does this have for understanding the relationship between Romans and, for instance, 1 Thessalonians, 2 Corinthians, or Ephesians? Further, the dynamic of purity and divine presence in Romans raises the question of whether Galatians, which has historically been viewed as closely related to Romans, offers a similar perspective in relation to Jesus' agency, the human condition, the spirit, and similar matters. These are some areas that may be explored in view of the research on the language of glory in Paul's Letter to the Romans offered here.

Bibliography

- Agersnap, Sören. *Baptism and the New Life: A Study of Romans 6:1-14*. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 1999.
- Ambrosiaster. *Ambrosiaster's Commentary on the Pauline Epistles: Romans*. Translated by Theodor S. de Bruyn. Atlanta: SBL, 2017.
- Bailey, Daniel P. "Jesus as the Mercy Seat: The Semantics and Theology of Paul's Use of *Hilasterion* in Romans 3:25." Ph.D. diss. University of Cambridge, 1999.
- Barrett, C. K. *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*. BNTC. London: Adam & Charles Black, 1957.
- Barclay, John M. G. 1991. "Paul, Philemon and Christian Slave-Ownership." *NTS* 1991 (37): 161-86.
- . 1996. "'Do we undermine the Law?' A Study of Romans 14.1-15.6." Pages 287-308 in *Paul and the Mosaic Law*. Edited by James D. G. Dunn. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- . 2010. "'I Will Have Mercy on whom I Have Mercy': The Golden Calf and Divine Mercy in Romans 9-11 and Second Temple Judaism." *Early Christianity* 1: 82-106.
- . 2015. *Paul and the Gift*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Barton, Carlin A. *Roman Honor: The Fire in the Bones*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001.
- Barton, Stephen C. *The Spirituality of the Gospels*. London: SPCK, 1992.
- Bauer, Walter. *Das Johannesevangelium*. HNT 6. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul) Siebeck, 1925.
- Bell, Richard H. *Provoked to Jealousy: The Origin and Purpose of the Jealousy Motif in Romans 9-11*. WUNT II/63. J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck): Tübingen, 1994.
- Ben Ezra, Daniel Stökl. *The Impact of Yom Kippur on Early Christianity: The Day of Atonement from Second Temple Judaism to the Fifth Century*. WUNT 163. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003.
- Bentall, Jonathan D. "Jeremiah's Temple Sermon and the Hermeneutics of Tradition: A Theological Reading of Jeremiah 7:1-15 and 26:1-24." Ph.D. diss. Durham University, 2017.
- Beker, J. Christiaan. *Paul the Apostle: The Triumph of God in Life and Thought*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980.
- Berry, Donald L. *Glory in Romans and the Unified Purpose of God in Redemptive History*. Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2016.
- Black, Matthew. *Romans*. New Century Bible Commentary. London: Marshal, Morgan, & Scott; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1973.
- Blackwell, Ben C. "Immortal Glory and the Problem of Death." *JSNT* 32 (2010): 285-308.
- Blidstein, Moshe. *Purity, Community, and Ritual in Early Christian Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2017.
- Bockmuehl, Markus. 1997. *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Philippians*. BNTC. London: A. & C. Black.
- . 2017. "The personal presence of Jesus in the writings of Paul," *SJT* 70: 39-60.
- Bohlen, Maren. *Sanctorum Communio: Die Christen als 'Heilige' bei Paulus*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2011.
- Boobyer, George H. "Thanksgiving" and the "Glory of God" in Paul. Borna-Leipzig: Robert Noske, 1929.

- Boylan, Patrick C. *St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans: Translation and Commentary*. Dublin: M. H. Gill and Son, 1934.
- Brockington, L. H. "The Greek Translator of Isaiah and his Interest in ΔΟΞΑ." *VT* 1 (1951): 23-32.
- Bryan, Christopher. *The Resurrection of the Messiah*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Byrne, Brendan. *Romans*. SP 6. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical, 1996.
- Bultmann, Rudolf. *Theology of the New Testament*. Translated by Kendrick Grobel. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2007.
- Byrskog, Samuel. "Christology and Identity in an Intertextual Perspective: The Glory of Adam in the Narrative Substructure of Paul's Letter to the Romans." Pages 1-18 in *Identity Formation in the New Testament*. Edited by Bengt Holmberg and Mikael Winninge. WUNT 227. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.
- Calvin, John. *Commentaries on the Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Romans*. Translated by John Owen. Edinburgh: T. Constable, 1849.
- Campbell, Constantine R. "Metaphor, Reality, and Union with Christ." Pages 61-86 in *"In Christ" in Paul: Explorations in Paul's Theology of Union and Participation*. Edited by Michael J. Thate et al. WUNT II/384. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014.
- Campbell, Douglas A. 1992. *The Rhetoric of Righteousness in Romans 3.21-26*. JSNTSup 65. Sheffield: JSOT.
- . 2009. *The Deliverance of God: An Apocalyptic Rereading of Justification in Paul*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- . 2014. *Framing Paul: An Epistolary Biography* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans).
- Campbell, Gordon. *Lucretius on Creation and Evolution: A Commentary on De Rerum Natura Book Five, Lines 772-1104*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Cancik, Hubert. "The End of the World, of History, and of the Individual in Greek and Roman Antiquity." Pages 84-125 in *The Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism. Volume I: The Origins of Apocalypticism in Judaism and Christianity*. Edited by John J. Collins. London: Continuum, 2000.
- Carroll, Lewis. *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland and Through the Looking-Glass and What Alice Found There*. London: Penguin, 2009.
- Chang, Kei Eun. *The Community, the Individual, and the Common Good: To Idiom and To Sympheron in the Greco-Roman World and Paul*. LNTS. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2013.
- Chernus, Ira. "Visions of God in Merkabah Mysticism." *JSJ* 13 (1982): 124-46.
- Chibici-Revneanu, Nicole. *Die Herrlichkeit des Verherrlichten*. WUNT II/231. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007.
- Chrysostom, John. *The Homilies of Saint John Chrysostom, Archbishop of Constantinople, on the Epistle of St. Paul the Apostle to the Romans, Translated, with Notes and Indices*. Translated by Charles Marriott. Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1848.
- Cirafesi, Wally V. "'To Fall Short' or 'To Lack'? Reconsidering the Meaning and Translation of ὕστερον in Rom 3:23." *ExpTim* 123 (2012): 429-34.
- Cogan, Morton. *Imperialism and Religion: Assyria, Judah, and Israel in the Eighth and Seventh Centuries B. C. E*. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1974.
- Collins, Raymond F. *Studies on the First Letter to the Thessalonians*. BETL 66; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1984.
- Coppens, J. "La gloire des croyants d'après les lettres paulinennes." *ETL* 46 (1970) 389-92.

- Cranfield, C. E. B. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*. 2 vols. ICC. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1975.
- Crook, Zeba. *Reconceptualising Conversion*. BZNW 130. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2004.
- Cullmann, Oscar. *Christ and Time: The Primitive Christian Conception of Time and History*. Translated by Floyd V. Filson. Rev. ed. London: SCM, 1962.
- Dahl, Nils A. 1977. *Studies in Paul*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House.
- . 2000. “The Concept of Baptism in Ephesians.” Pages 413-39 in *Studies in Ephesians*. WUNT 131. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul) Siebeck.
- Das, A. Andrew. 2001. *Paul, the Law, and the Covenant*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.
- . 2007. *Solving the Romans Debate*. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- Deissmann, Adolf. *Light from the Ancient East: The New Testament Illustrated by Recently Discovered Texts of the Graeco-Roman World*. 4th ed. Translated by Lionel M. Strachan. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1927.
- DeSilva, David A. 1999. *The Hope of Glory: Honor Discourse and New Testament Interpretation*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical.
- . 2008. *Despising Shame: Honor Discourse and Community Maintenance in the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Rev. ed. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Do, Toan J. “The LXX Background of ΙΑΑΣΘΗΠΙΟΝ in Rom 3,25.” Pages 641-57 in *The Letter to the Romans*. Edited by Udo Schnelle. BETL 226. Leuven: Peeters, 2009.
- Dobschütz, Ernst von. *Die Thessalonischer-Briefe*. 7th ed. KEK. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1909.
- Dodd, C. H. 1931. “ΙΑΣΚΕΣΘΑΙ, Its Cognates, Derivatives, and Synonyms, in the Septuagint.” *JTS* 32: 352-60.
- . 1932. *The Epistle of Paul to the Romans*. MNTC. London: Hodder and Stoughton.
- Duff, Paul B. *Moses in Corinth: The Apologetic Context of 2 Corinthians 3*. NovTSup 159. Leiden: Brill, 2015.
- Dunn, James D. G. 1974. “Paul’s Understanding of the Death of Jesus.” Pages 125-41 in *Reconciliation and Hope. New Testament Essays on Atonement and Eschatology Presented to L.L. Morris on his 60th Birthday*. Carlisle: Paternoster, 1974.
- . 1988a. D. G. *Romans 1-8*. WBC. Dallas: Word, 1988.
- . 1988b. *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- . 1989. *Christology in the Making: A New Testament Enquiry into the Origins of the Doctrine of the Incarnation*. 2nd ed. London: SCM.
- . 2012. “Adam and Christ.” Pages 125-38 in *Reading Paul’s Letter to the Romans*. Edited by Jerry Sumney. RBS 73. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.
- Easter, Matthew C. “The Pistis Christou Debate: Main Arguments and Responses in Summary.” *Currents in Biblical Research* 9 (2010): 33-47.
- Eastman, Susan. “Whose Apocalypse? The Identity of the Sons of God in Romans 8:19.” *JBL* 121 (2002): 263-77.
- Ehrensperger, Kathy. 2007. *Paul and the Dynamics of Power: Communication and Interaction in the Early Christ-Movement*. London: T&T Clark.
- . 2010. “‘Called to Be Saints’ – The Identity Shaping Dimension of Paul’s Priestly Discourse in Romans.” Pages 90-110 in *Reading Paul in Context: Explorations in Identity Formation*. LNTS. London: T&T Clark.
- Engberg-Pedersen, Troels, ed. *Paul Beyond the Judaism/Hellenism Divide*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001.

- . 2008. “‘Everything is clean’ and ‘Everything that is not of faith is sin’; The Logic of Pauline Casuistry in Romans 14.1-15.13.” Pages 22-38 in *Paul, Grace, and Freedom: Essays in Honour of John K. Riches*. New York: T&T Clark, 2008.
- Esler, Philip F. 1998. *Galatians*. London: Routledge.
- . 2003. *Conflict and Identity in Romans: The Social Setting of Paul's Letter*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Evans, Craig F. *Resurrection and the New Testament*. London: SCM, 1970.
- Fatchi, Mehrdad. *The Spirit's Relation to the Risen Lord in Paul*. WUNT 128. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000.
- Fee, Gordon D. 1987. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- . 1994. *God's Empowering Presence: The Holy Spirit in the Letters of Paul*. Peabody: Hendrickson.
- . 2009. *The First and Second Letters to the Thessalonians*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Finlan, Stephen. *The Background and Content of Paul's Cultic Atonement Metaphors*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2004.
- Finney, Mark T. *Honour and Conflict in the Ancient World: 1 Corinthians in its Greco-Roman Social Setting*. LNTS. London: T&T Clark, 2012.
- Fiorenza, Elizabeth Schüssler. “Cultic Language in Qumran and in the New Testament.” *CBQ* 38 (1976): 156-77.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. 1993. *Romans*. AB 33. New York: Doubleday.
- . 2008. *First Corinthians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 32. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Foster, Paul. 2016. *Colossians*. BNTC. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark.
- . 2012. “Who Wrote 2 Thessalonians? A Fresh Look at an Old Problem.” *JSNT* 35: 150-75.
- Fowl, Stephen E. *Philippians*. The Two Horizons Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.
- Fredriksen, Paula. 2005. “Paul, Purity, and the *Ekklēsia* of the Gentiles.” Pages 205-17 in *The Beginnings of Christianity: A Collection of Articles*. Edited by Jack Pastor and Menachem Mor. Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi.
- . 2017. *Paul: The Pagan's Apostle*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Frey, Jörg. 2013. “God's Dwelling on Earth: ‘Shekhina-Theology’ in Revelation 21 and in the Gospel of John.” Pages 79-103 in *John's Gospel and Intimations of Apocalyptic*. Edited by Catrin H. Williams and Christopher Rowland. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark.
- . 2014. “The Use of δόξα in Paul and John as Shaped by the Septuagint.” Pages 85-103 in *The Reception of Septuagint Words in Jewish-Hellenistic Christian Literature*. Edited by Eberhard Bons, Ralph Brucker, and Jan Joosten. WUNT II/367. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Furnish, V. P. “Living to God, Walking in Love: Theology and Ethics in Romans.” Pages 187-202 in *Reading Paul's Letter to the Romans*. Edited by Jerry L. Sumney. Atlanta: SBL, 2012.
- Gager, John G. *Reinventing Paul*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Gaston, Lloyd. *Paul and the Torah*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1987.
- Gamble, Harry. *The Textual History of the Letter to the Romans*. Studies and Documents 42. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977.

- Gathercole, Simon. "Locating Christ and Israel in Romans 9-11." Pages 115-39 in *God and Israel: Providence and Purposes in Romans 9-11*. Edited by Todd D. Still. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2017.
- Gaventa, Beverly R. 2007. "God Handed Them Over." Pages 113-23 in *Our Mother Saint Paul*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2007.
- . 2009. "'To Preach the Gospel': Romans 1,15 and the Purposes of Romans." Pages 179-95. *The Letter to the Romans*. Edited by Udo Schnelle. BETL 226. Leuven: Peeters.
- . 2014. "The 'Glory of God' in Paul's Letter to the Romans." Pages 29-40 in *Interpretation and the Claims of the Text: Resourcing New Testament Theology. Essays in Honor of Charles H. Talbert*. Edited by Jason A. Whitlark et al. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press.
- Gieniusz, Andrzej. *Romans 8:18-30: "Suffering Does Not Thwart the Future Glory"*. Atlanta: Scholars, 1999.
- Gilchrest, Eric J. *Revelation 21-22 in Light of Jewish and Greco-Roman Utopianism*. Biblical Interpretation Series 118; Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- Glaim, Aaron. "Reciprocity, Sacrifice, and Salvation in Judean Religion at the Turn of the Era." Ph.D. diss. Brown University, 2014.
- Goldberg, Arnold M. *Untersuchungen über die Vorstellung von der Shekhinah in der frühen rabbinischen Literatur: Talmud und Midrasch*. SJ 5. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1969.
- Gorman, Michael J. 2009. *Inhabiting the Cruciform God: Kenosis, Justification, and Theosis in Paul's Narrative Soteriology*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- . 2011. "Romans: The First Christian Treatise on Theosis." *Journal of Theological Interpretation* 5: 13-34.
- . 2017. *Apostle of the Crucified Lord: A Theological Introduction to Paul and His Letters*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Grieb, Katherine. "The Righteousness of God." Pages 65-78 in *Reading Paul's Letter to the Romans*. Edited by Jerry L. Sumney. Atlanta: SBL, 2012.
- Grindheim, Sigurd. "A Theology of Glory: Paul's use of Δόξα in Romans." *JBL* 136 (2017): 451-65.
- Gupta, Nijay. *Worship that Makes Sense to Paul: A New Approach to the Theology and Ethics of Paul's Cultic Metaphors*. BZNW. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2010.
- Gustaffson, Gabriella. *Evocatio Deorum: Historical and Mythical Interpretations of Ritualised Conquests in the Expansion of Ancient Rome*. Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis Historia Religionum 16. Uppsala: Uppsala University, 1999.
- Guthrie, W. K. C. *In the Beginning: Some Greek Views on the Origins of Life and the Early State of Man*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1957.
- Günther, Linda Marie. "Concepts of Purity in Ancient Greece, with Particular Emphasis on Sacred Sites." Pages 245-60 in *Purity and the Forming of Religious Traditions in the Ancient Mediterranean World and Ancient Judaism*. Edited by Christian Frevel and Christophe Nihan. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- Hayes, Christine. *Gentiles Impurities and Jewish Identities: Intermarriage and Conversion from the Bible to the Talmud*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Haacker, Klaus. *Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer*. 3rd ed. ThHK 6. Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2006.

- Hafemann, Scott. *Paul, Moses, and the History of Israel: The Letter/Spirit Contrast and the Argument from Scripture in 2 Corinthians 3*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1995.
- Harland, Philip A. Harland, *Associations, Synagogues, and Congregations: Claiming a Place in Ancient Mediterranean Society*. 2nd ed. n.p. Cited 5 Apr 2018. Online: <http://www.philipharland.com/associations>.
- Harris, W. V. *War and Imperialism in Republican Rome 327-70 B.C.* Oxford: Clarendon, 1979.
- Harrison, E. F. "The Use of Doxa in Greek Literature with special reference to the New Testament." PhD. Diss., Pennsylvania. Published in Ann Arbor University Microfilms no. 2871, Michigan, 1950.
- Harrison, James R. 2003. *Paul's Language of Grace in Its Graeco-Roman Context*. WUNT II/172; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- . 2010. "The Brothers as the 'Glory of Christ' (2 Cor 8:23): Paul's *Doxa* Terminology in Its Ancient Benefaction Context." *NovT* 52: 156-88.
- . 2011. "Paul and the Roman Ideal of Glory in the Epistle to the Romans." Pages 201-69 in *Paul and the Imperial Authorities in Thessalonica and Rome: A Study in the Conflict of Ideology*. WUNT 273; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- . 2015. "Paul and Ancient Civic Ethics: Redefining the Canon of Honour in the Graeco-Roman World." Pages 75-118 in *Paul's Graeco-Roman Context*. BETL 277; Leuven : Peeters.
- Hays, Richard B. "Humanity Prior to the Revelation of Faith." Pages 61-77 in *Beyond Bultmann: Reckoning a New Testament Theology*. Edited by Bruce Longenecker and Mikael Parsons. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2014.
- Heath, Jane M. F. *Paul's Visual Piety: The Metamorphosis of the Beholder*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Hellermann, Joseph H. *Reconstructing Honor in Roman Philippi: Carmen Christi as Cursus Pudorum*. SNTSMS 132. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Hooker, Morna D. "Adam in Romans 1." *NTS* 6 (1960): 297-306.
- Hundley, Michael. *Gods in Dwellings: Temples and Divine Presence in the Ancient Near East*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2013.
- Hunn, Debbie. "Debating the Faithfulness of Jesus Christ in Twentieth-Century Scholarship." Pages 15-32 in *The Faith of Jesus Christ: Exegetical, Biblical, and Theological Studies*. Edited by Michael Bird and Preston Sprinkle. Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 2010.
- Hurtado, Larry. "The Doxology at the End of Romans." Pages 195-99 in *New Testament Textual Criticism: Its Significance for Exegesis. Essays in Honour of Bruce M. Metzger*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981.
- Jacob, Haley Goranson. *Conformed to the Image: Reconsidering Paul's Theology of Glory in Romans*. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2018.
- Jervell, Jacob. *Imago Dei: Gen 1,26f im Spätjudentum, in der Gnosis und in den paulinischen Briefen*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960.
- Jewett, Robert. *Romans*. Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2009.
- Jipp, Joshua M. *Christ is King: Paul's Royal Ideology*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2015.
- Joubert, Stephan. *Paul as Benefactor: Reciprocity, Strategy, and Theological Reflection in Paul's Collection*. WUNT II/124; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000.
- Karris, Robert J. "Romans 14.1-15.13 and the Occasion of Romans." Pages 65-84 in *The Romans Debate*. Edited by Karl P. Donfried. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1977.

- Käsemann, Ernst. 1950. "Zum Verständnis von Römer 3,24-26." *ZNW* 43: 150-54.
- . 1980. *Commentary on Romans*. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Keener, Craig. 2005. *1-2 Corinthians*. NCBC. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- . 2009. *Romans: A New Covenant Commentary*. Cambridge: Lutterworth.
- Klawans, Jonathan. 2000. *Impurity and Sin in Ancient Judaism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 2006. *Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple: Symbolism and Supersessionism in the Study of Ancient Judaism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kittel, Helmut. *Die Herrlichkeit Gottes: Studien zu Geschichte und Wesen eines Neutestamentlichen Begriffs*. Gießen: Alfred Töpelmann, 1934.
- Kotansky, Roy. *Greek Magical Amulets: The Inscribed Gold, Silver, Copper, and Bronze Lamellae Part I Published Texts of Known Provenance*. *Papyrologica Coloniensia* 22.1. Springer Fachmedien Wiesbaden, 1994.
- Kugel, James L. *Traditions of the Bible: A Guide to the Bible as It Was at the Start of the Common Era*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1998.
- Kulik, Alexander. *3 Baruch: Greek-Slavonic Apocalypse of Baruch*. CEJL. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2010.
- Kümmel, Werner G. 1929. *Römer 7 und die Bekehrung des Paulus*. UNT 17; Leipzig: Hinrichs.
- . 1975. *Introduction to the New Testament*. 17th ed. Translated by Howard C. Kee. London: SCM.
- Lagrange, Marie-Joseph. *Saint Paul Épître Aux Romains*. Paris: Librairie Lecoffre, 1950.
- Lambrecht, Jan. *The Wretched "I" and its Liberation: Paul in Romans 7 and 8* (Louvain: Peeters/Eerdmans, 1992).
- Lampe, Peter. "Paul, Patrons, and Clients," in *Paul in the Greco-Roman World: A Handbook*. Edited by J. Paul Sampley. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2003.
- Lee, John. "Transgression in Roman religion." Ph.D. diss. Yale University, 2012.
- Leenhardt, Franz J. *The Epistle to the Romans: A Commentary*. Translated by Harold Knight. London: Lutterworth Press, 1961.
- Légasse, Simon. *L'épître de Paul aux Romains*. LD Commentaires 10. Paris: Cerf, 2001.
- London, John E. *Empire of Honour: The Art of Government in the Roman World*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1997.
- Lennon, Jack. "Carnal, Bloody, and Unnatural Acts: Religious Pollution in Ancient Rome." Ph.D. diss. University of Nottingham, 2011.
- Levine, Baruch E. "On the Presence of God in Biblical Religion." Pages 71-87 in *Religions in Antiquity: Essays in Memory of Erwin Ramsdell Goodenough*. Edited by Jacob Neusner. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1968.
- Levison, John R. *Portraits of Adam in Early Judaism: From Sirach to 2 Baruch*. Sheffield: JSOT, 1988.
- Lidzbarski, Mark. *Ginzā: Das große Buch der Mandäer*. *Quellen der Religionsgeschichte* 13/4. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978.
- Lietzmann, Hans. *An die Korinther I/II*. HNT 9. 5th ed. Revised by W. G. Kümmel. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1969.
- Lincoln, Andrew T. *Paradise Now and Not Yet*. SNTSMS 43. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.

- Linebaugh, Jonathan A. "Announcing the Human: Rethinking the Relationship between Wisdom of Solomon 13-15 and Rom 1:18-2:11." *NTS* 57 (2011): 214-37.
- Linke, Bernhard. "Sacral Purity and Social Order in Ancient Rome." Pages 289-309 in *Purity and the Forming of Religious Traditions in the Ancient Mediterranean World and Ancient Judaism*. Edited by Christian Frevel and Christophe Nihan. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- Lietzmann, Hans. *An die Römer*. HNT 8. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck) 1928.
- Liu, Yulin. *Temple Purity in 1-2 Corinthians*. WUNT II/243; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.
- Lohse, Eduard. *Der Brief an die Römer. Übersetzt und Erklärt*. 15th ed. KEKNT. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2003.
- Longenecker, Bruce W. 1991. *Eschatology and the Covenant: A Comparison of 4 Ezra and Romans 1-11*. JSNTSup 57; Sheffield: JSOT.
- . 1993. ΠΙΣΤΙΣ in Romans 3.25: Neglected Evidence for the 'Faithfulness of Christ'?" *NTS* 39: 478-80.
- Longenecker, Richard N. 2011. *Introducing Romans: Critical Issues in Paul's Most Famous Letter*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- . 2017. *The Epistle to the Romans*. NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Lyonnet, Stanislas. "L'histoire du salut selon le chapitre VII de l'Épître aux Romains," *Biblica* 43 (1962): 117-51.
- Macaskill, Grant. *Union with Christ in the New Testament*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.
- MacDonald, Nathan. "The Spirit of God: A Neglected Conceptualization of the Divine Presence in the Persian Period." Pages 95-120 in *Divine Presence and Absence in the Persian Period*. Edited by N. MacDonald and I. J. de Hulster. FAT II. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.
- Malherbe, Abraham J. "Gentile as a Nurse: The Cynic Background of I Thess ii." *NovT* 12 (1970): 203-17.
- Malina, Bruce J. *The New Testament World: Insights from Cultural Anthropology*. 3rd ed. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2001.
- Malina, Bruce J., and John J. Pilch, *Social-Science Commentary on the Letters of Paul*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2006.
- Maher, Michael. *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Genesis*. ArBib 1B. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical, 1992.
- Martin, Dale. *Sex and the Single Savior: Gender and Sexuality in Biblical Interpretation*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2006.
- Matera, Frank J. *Romans*. Paideia. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2010.
- McLean, Bradley H. *The Cursed Christ: Mediterranean Expulsion Rituals and Pauline Soteriology*. JSNTSup 126. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1996.
- Michel, Otto. *An die Römer*. 14th ed. KEK. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1955.
- Milgrom, Jacob. *Studies in Cultic Theology and Terminology*. Leiden: Brill, 1983.
- Mitchell, Margaret M. *The Heavenly Trumpet: John Chrysostom and the Art of Pauline Interpretation*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2002.
- Moo, Douglas J. *The Epistle to the Romans*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996.
- Morgan, Teresa. *Roman Faith and Christian Faith: Pistis and Fides in the Early Roman Empire and Early Churches*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015.
- Morris, Leon. 1983. *The Atonement: Its Meaning and Significance*. Leicester: Inter-Varsity, 1983.

- . *The Epistle to the Romans*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988.
- Moxnes, Halvor. "Honour and Righteousness in Romans." *JSNT* 32 (1988): 61-77.
- Muraoka, T. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*. Louvain; Peeters, 2009.
- Myer, Ben F. "The Pre-Pauline Formula in Rom. 3:25-26a." *NTS* 29 (1983): 198-208.
- Nagy, Gregory. *The Best of the Achaeans: Concepts of the Hero in Ancient Greek Poetry*. Baltimore: John Hopkins, 1979.
- Nanos, Mark D. *The Mystery of Romans: the Jewish Context of Paul's Letter*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996.
- Neusner, Jacob. *Genesis Rabbah: The Judaic Commentary to the Book of Genesis. A New American Translation*. BJS 105: Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985.
- Newman, Carey C. *Paul's Glory-Christology: Tradition and Rhetoric*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1992.
- Newton, Michael. *The Concept of Purity and Qumran and the Letters of Paul*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.
- Neyrey, Jerome E. 1998. *Honor and Shame in the Gospel of Matthew*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox.
- . 2005. "God, Benefactor, and Patron: The Major Cultural Model for Interpreting the Deity in Greco-Roman Antiquity." *JSNT* 27: 465-92.
- O'Brien, Peter T. *Introductory Thanksgivings in the Letters of Paul*. Leiden; E. J. Brill, 1977.
- Origen. 2001. *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans Books 1-5*. Translated by Thomas P. Scheck. Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press.
- . 2002. *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans Books 6-10*. Translated by Thomas P. Scheck. Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press.
- Ortlund, Dane. "Inaugurated Glorification: Revisiting Romans 8:30." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 57 (2014) 111-33.
- Pak, G Sujin. "Luther, Melancthon, and Calvin on Romans 5 and 13: Three Reformation Approaches to Reading Romans. Pages 121-47 in *Reformation Readings of Romans*. Edited by Kathy Ehrensperger and R. Ward Holder. New York: T&T Clark International, 2008.
- Petrovic, Andrej, and Ivana Petrovic. *Inner Purity and Pollution in Greek Religion: Volume I: Early Greek Religion*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016.
- Plevnik, Joseph. *Paul and Parousia: An Exegetical and Theological Investigation*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2014.
- Porter, Stanley E., and Wally V. Cirafesi. "ὅστερ'εὼ and πίστις Χριστοῦ in Romans 3:23: A Response to Steven Enderlein." *Journal for the Study of Paul and his Letters* 3 (2013): 1-9.
- Rahlfs, Alfred. *Septuaginta: Id est Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes*. 2 vols. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1979.
- Raith II, Charles. *Aquinas and Calvin on Romans: God's Justification and Our Participation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.
- Reasoner, Mark. *The Strong and the Weak: Romans 14.1-15:13 in Context*. SNTSMS 10. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Renwick, David A. *Paul, the Temple, and the Presence of God*. BJS 224. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991.
- Rodríguez, Rafael. *If You Call Yourself a Jew: Reappraising Paul's Letter to the Romans*. Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2014.

- Rodríguez, Rafael, and Matthew Thiessen, eds. *The So-Called Jew in Paul's Letter to the Romans*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2016.
- Rückert, Leopold I. *Commentar über den Brief Pauli an die Römer*. Leipzig: Hartmann, 1831.
- Rüpke, Jörg. "Representation or presence? Picturing the divine in ancient Rome," *Archiv für Religionsgeschichte* 12 (2010): 181-96.
- Sanday, William, and Arthur C. Headlam. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*. 5th ed. ICC. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1902.
- Sanders, E. P. *Paul: The Apostle's Life, Letters, and Thought*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2015.
- Saussure, Ferdinand. *Course in General Linguistics*. Edited by Charles Bally and Albert Sechehaye. Translated by Roy Harris. 3rd ed.; Chicago: Open Court, 1986.
- Scheck, Thomas P. *Origen and the History of Justification: The Legacy of Origen's Commentary on Romans*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2008.
- Scheid, John. "The Expiation of Impieties Committed without Intention and the Formation of Roman Theology." Pages 331-47 in *Transformation of the Inner Self in Ancient Religions*. Edited by Jan Assmann and Guy G. Stroumsa. SHR 83; Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Schlier, Heinrich. *Der Römerbrief: Kommentar*. HTKNT 6; Freiburg im Breslau: Herder, 1977.
- Schnelle, Udo. *Theology of the New Testament*. Translated by M. Eugene Boring. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2009.
- Schnabel, Eckhard J. *Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer*. Historisch Theologische Auslegung. Witten: SCM R. Brockhaus; Giessen: Brunnen, 2015.
- Schreiner, Thomas R. *Romans*. BECNT. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1998.
- Schuller, Eileen M., and Carol A. Newsom. *The Hodayot (Thanksgiving Psalms): A Study Edition of IQH^a*. SBLEJL 36. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2012.
- Schwartz, Seth. *Were the Jews a Mediterranean Society*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010.
- Schweitzer, Albert. *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle*. Translated by William Montgomery. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1931.
- Schwindt, Rainer. *Gesichte der Herrlichkeit: Eine exegetisch-traditionsgeschichtliche Studie zur paulinischen und johanneischen Christologie*. Herder's Biblische Studien 50. Freiburg: Herder, 2007.
- Sellin, Gerhard. *Der Brief an die Epheser*. KEKNT 8. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2008.
- Sprinkle, Preston. "The Afterlife in Romans: Understanding Paul's Glory Motif in Light of the Apocalypse of Moses and 2 Baruch." Pages 216-29 in *Lebendige Hoffnung – ewiger Tod?!: Jenseitsvorstellungen im Hellenismus, Judentum, und Christentum*. Edited by Michael Labahn and Manfred Lang. Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2007.
- Stegman, Thomas D. *Second Corinthians*. Catholic Commentary on Sacred Scripture. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2009.
- Stockhausen, Carol K. *Moses' Veil and the Glory of the New Covenant: The Exegetical Substructure of II Cor. 3,1-4,6*. AnBib 116. Rome: Pontifical Institute, 1989.
- Stowers, Stanley K. 1981. Stanley K. Stowers, *The Diatribe and Paul's Letter to the Romans*. SBLDS 57. Chico: Scholars.
- . *A Rereading of Romans: Justice, Jews, and Gentiles*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994.

- Stuckenbruck, Loren T. "Posturing 'Apocalyptic' in Pauline Theology: How Much Contrast to Jewish Tradition?" Pages 241-56 in *The Myth of Rebellious Angels*. WUNT 335. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014.
- Stühlmacher, Peter. "Zur neueren Exegese von Röm 3,24-26." Pages 313-33 in *Jesus und Paulus: Festschrift für Werner Georg Kümmel zum 70 Geburtstag*. Edited by E. E. Ellis, E. Grässer. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975.
- Taylor, N. H. "The Composition and Chronology of 2 Corinthians." *JSNT* 44 (1991): 75-78.
- Thiessen, Matthew. 2016. *Paul and the Gentile Problem*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 2016. "The Many for One or One for the Many? Reading Mark 10:45 in the Roman Empire." *HTR* 109: 447-66.
- Thorsteinsson, Runar. *Paul's Interlocutor in Romans 2: Function and Identity in the Context of Ancient Epistolography*. Coniectanea Biblica. New Testament Series 40. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 2003.
- Thrall, Margaret E. 1976. "2 Corinthians 1:12: ΑΓΙΟΤΗΤΙ or ΑΠΛΟΤΗΤΙ?" Pages 366-72 in *Studies in New Testament Language and Text: Essays in Honour of G. D. Kilpatrick on the Occasion of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday*. NovTSup 44. Edited by J. K. Elliott. Leiden: Brill.
- . 1994. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians*. ICC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- Tholuck, Frederick A. *Exposition of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans*. Translated by Robert Menzies. Philadelphia: Sorin and Ball, 1844.
- Trilling, Wolfgang. *Der Zweite Brief an die Thessalonicher*. EKK 14. Zürich: Benziger; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1980.
- Tromp, Johannes. *The Life of Adam and Eve in Greek*. PVTG 6; Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- Ullucci, Daniel C. *The Christian Rejection of Animal Sacrifice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Vahrenhorst, Martin. *Kultische Sprache in den Paulusbriefen*. WUNT 230. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.
- Van Kooten, George H. *Paul's Anthropology in Context: The Image of God, Assimilation to God, and Tripartite Man in Ancient Judaism, Ancient Philosophy and Early Christianity*. WUNT 232. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.
- Van Seters, John. *Prologue to History: The Yahwist as Historian in Genesis*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1992.
- Verbrugge, Verlyn D. "The Grammatical Internal Evidence for ἑξομην in Romans 5:1." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 54 (2011): 559-72.
- Vermes, Geza. *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English*. 4th ed. London: Penguin, 1995.
- Vermeulen, A. J. *The semantic development of Gloria in early-Christian Latin*. Nijmegen: Dekker & van de Vegt, 1956.
- Vis, Joshua M. "The Purgation of Persons through the Purification Offering." Pages 33-57 in *Sacrifice, Cult, and Atonement in Early Judaism and Christianity: Constituents and Critique*. Edited by Henrietta L. Wiley and Christian A. Eberhart. Atlanta: SBL, 2017.
- Vogel, Martin. "Versöhnung und Streit: Notizen zur Literarkritik des 2. Korintherbriefes in der neueren Forschung." Pages 87-107 in *Spurensuche zur Einleitung in das Neue Testament: Eine Festschrift im Dialog mit Udo Schnelle*. Edited by Michael Labahn. FRLANT 271. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2017.

- Wagner, J. Ross. "'Enemies' Yet 'Beloved' Still: Election and the Love of God in Romans 9-11." Pages 95-113 in *God and Israel: Providence and Purposes in Romans 9-11*. Edited by Todd D. Still. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2017.
- Wallace-Hadrill, Andrew, ed. *Patronage in Ancient Society*. London: Routledge, 1990.
- Wardle, Timothy. "Pillars, Foundations, and Stones: Individual Believers as Constituent Parts of the Early Christian Communal Temple." Pages 289-309 in *Sacrifice, Cult, and Atonement in Early Judaism and Christianity: Constituents and Critique*. Edited by Henrietta L. Wiley and Christian A. Eberhart. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2017.
- Wasserman, Emma. *The Death of the Soul in Romans 7*. WUNT II/256. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.
- Wedderburn, A. J. M. "Adam in Paul's Letter to the Romans." Pages 413-30 in *Studia Biblica 1978, III: Papers on Paul and Other New Testament Authors*. Edited by E. A. Livingstone. Sheffield: JSOT, 1981.
- Weima, Jeffrey A. D. *Neglected Endings: The Significance of the Pauline Letter Closings*. JSNTSup 101. Sheffield: JSOT, 1994.
- Whittle, Sarah. 2014. *Covenant Renewal and the Consecration of the Gentiles*. SNTSMS 161. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2014. "Purity in Paul." Pages 134-52 in *Purity: Essays in Bible and Theology*. Edited by Andrew Brower Latz and Arseny Ermakov. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock.
- Williams, Jarvis J. "Cultic Action and Cultic Function in Second Temple Jewish Martyrologies: The Jewish Martyrs as Israel's Yom Kippur." Pages 233-62 in *Sacrifice, Cult, and Atonement in Early Judaism and Christianity: Constituents and Critique*. Edited by Henrietta L. Wiley and Christian A. Eberhart. Atlanta: SBL, 2017.
- Wischmeyer, Oda. "Konzepte von Zeit bei Paulus und im Markusevangelium." Pages 361-92 in *Paul and Mark: Comparative Essays. Part I, Two Authors at the Beginning of Christianity*. Edited by Oda Wischmeyer et al. BZNW 198. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2014.
- Wolter, Michael. 1978. *Rechtfertigung und zukünftiges Heil: Untersuchungen zu Röm 5,1-11*. BZNW 43. Berlin: deGruyter, 1978.
- . 2014. *Der Brief an die Römer. Teilband 1: Röm 1-8*. EKK 6/1. Neukirchen-Vlluy: Neukirchener; Ostfildern: Patmos.
- . 2017. "'It is Not as Though the Word of God Has Failed': God's Faithfulness and God's Free Sovereignty in Romans 9:6-29." Pages 27-47 in *God and Israel: Providence and Purposes in Romans 9-11*. Edited by Todd D. Still. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press.
- Wright, N. T. 1991. *The Climax of the Covenant*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- . 2002. "The Letter to the Romans: Introduction, Commentary, and Reflections." Pages 393-770 in *The New Interpreter's Bible*. Nashville: Abingdon, 2002.
- . 2013. *Paul and the Faithfulness of God*. 2 vols. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- Ziesler, John A. *The Meaning of Righteousness in Paul: A Linguistic and Theological Enquiry*. SNTSMS 20. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972.